

Ignacio de Antioquía, ¿testigo ocular de la muerte y resurrección de Jesús?

Cuando Zahn afirmaba que no se encuentran en Ignacio datos claros sobre su vida anterior y que, por lo menos, no merece ya la pena refutar que Ignacio pretenda haber visto todavía al Cristo resucitado en una aparición corpórea⁽¹⁾, no podía imaginar que la cuestión pudiera ser examinada de nuevo, ya que en el momento en que él escribía su magnífica monografía era prácticamente inviable pensar en una datación más temprana de las cartas de Ignacio. Zahn hacía referencia a opiniones de autores muy anteriores, tales como Daillé (1666) y Merx (1861), quienes, siguiendo a Jerónimo⁽²⁾, defendían que Ignacio había visto a Jesús en un cuerpo después de su resurrección.

La noticia de Jerónimo, por otro lado muy vulnerable, puesto que Jerónimo no conoció directamente las cartas de Ignacio, sino sólo a través de Eusebio, difícilmente podía ser tomada en serio. El hecho de que la versión anglo-latina (L, s. XIII), muy adherente al único códice griego (G) que se conserva de las cartas ignacianas, interpretara — al igual que Jerónimo — que Ignacio había visto per-

(¹) T. ZAHN, *Ignatius von Antiochien* [citado: *IvA*] (Gotha 1873): «Es sollte wenigstens nicht mehr der Widerlegung bedürfen, dass Ignatius vorgebe, den auferstandenen Christus in leibhafter Erscheinung noch gesehn zu haben. Er sagt an der so misverstandenen Stelle (Sm. 3) nur, er wisse und glaube, dass Christus auch nach der Auferstehung im Fleisch lebe» (401-402).

Las siglas usadas para las cartas ignacianas son las siguientes: 1) recensión media: Eph = Efesios; Mg = Magnesios; Tr = Tralianos; Rom = Romanos; Phld = Filadelfos; Sm = Esmirnenses; Pol = Policarpo; 2) recensión larga: las mismas, precedidas de «Ps» (PsEph, etc.), más Mar = María; Tar = Tarsenses; Phil = Filipenses; Ant = Antioquenos; Her = Herón.

(²) *De viris ill.* 16: «In qua et de evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium, dicens: *Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi, et credo quia sit*».

sonalmente al resucitado⁽³⁾ motivó que los comentaristas se dignaran concederle alguna atención.

Así Lightfoot, comentando Sm 3,1, aduce el pasaje de Jerónimo y deduce que éste «supone evidentemente que Ignacio ha visto a nuestro Señor en la carne»⁽⁴⁾. El sabio inglés piensa que esta interpretación podría haber sido estimulada por el relato, basado en una mala interpretación de Θεοφόρος, según el cual Ignacio sería el niño que Jesús bendijo. En contra, aduce el testimonio del Crisóstomo⁽⁵⁾ e intenta explicar el origen de esta falsa interpretación haciendo suya la conjetura de Pearson, según la cual aquélla derivaría de Jn 20,8.

En general, los comentaristas se limitan a traducir la frase como si se tratara de una cuasi-endíadis, «porque yo sé y creo, etc.». Bauer, por entender que Jerónimo aduce la frase en cuestión como si también ésta formara parte integrante del Evangelio de los Hebreos que acababa de traducir y que éste habría interpretado como si hablara un testigo ocular, niega rotundamente que dicha frase haya podido encontrarse en el Evangelio de los Hebreos⁽⁶⁾.

Schoedel no menciona ya para nada a Jerónimo e intenta explicar el innegable testimonio de Ignacio — obviamente lo interpreta como si fuera una endíadis — haciendo recurso a una posible interpretación positiva, por parte de los docetas, de la resurrección de Jesús, diciendo que éstos probablemente sostenían una versión espi-

⁽³⁾ Sm 3,1: «Ego enim et post resurrectionem in carne ipsum vidi, et credo existentem».

⁽⁴⁾ J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers* II, 2 [citado *AAFF* II, 2] (London 1889 [1885]) 294: «Jerome (...) translates 'in carne eum vidi et credo quia sit', as if it were εἶδον, and evidently supposes that Ignatius had seen our Lord in the flesh».

⁽⁵⁾ Juan Crisóstomo, *Hom. in S. Ign.* 4 (II, 599): τὸν οὐδὲ ἑωρακότα αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἀπολελαυκότα αὐτοῦ τῆς συνουσίας.

⁽⁶⁾ W. BAUER, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief* [citado: Bauer, *AAVV* II] (Tübingen 1920) 266-267: «Hieronymus zitiert de viris inl. 16 Richardson die Worte des Ign. ἐγὼ — ἐπίστευσαν als Bestandteil des *nuper* von ihm übersetzten Hebräerevangeliums (...) Auch kann ja das Stück ἐγὼ — ὄντα, das Hieronymus übrigens so versteht, als rede ein Augenzeuge (*vidi* statt οἶδα), entschieden nicht im Hebr. ev. gestanden haben». En la segunda edición, ampliada y actualizada por H. PAULSEN [citado: BAUER-PAULSEN, *AAVV* II] (Tübingen 1985) 92, se ha omitido prudentemente esta cuestión.

ritualizada de la misma⁽⁷⁾. Los docetas podrían haber hallado apoyo para su docetismo especialmente en el misterioso ir y venir del Cristo resucitado⁽⁸⁾.

En mi monografía consagrada a reexaminar la autenticidad de las cartas de Ignacio, preferí no abordar esta delicada cuestión⁽⁹⁾. Ahora, después de haber transcurrido un lapso prudencial de tiempo y una vez que los críticos se han podido pronunciar a favor o en contra de mi hipótesis, creo que ha llegado el momento de examinar de nuevo la frase en todo su contexto.

I. El pasaje clave de Sm 3

1. Contexto remoto: el credo antidoceta

En el encabezamiento de la Carta a los esmirnenses — por cierto, muy abrupto — Ignacio, al desgranar los artículos de fe correspondientes al símbolo de la comunidad, destaca mediante la triple repetición del adverbio ἀληθῶς los tres artículos fundamentales del credo cristiano, a la par que relativiza el bautismo silenciando el adverbio «realmente» a propósito del único hecho salvífico retenido por los docetas:

pues estáis plenamente convencidos de que nuestro Señor

- (1) desciende *realmente* de la estirpe de David por línea carnal, si bien es Hijo de Dios según el querer y la fuerza de Dios,
- (2) nació *realmente* de una Virgen,
- (3) quedó bautizado por Juan, 'para que se cumpliera por su medio toda la justicia' (cf. Mt 3,15),
- (4) *realmente*, bajo Poncio Pilato y el tetrarca Herodes, fue clavado en una cruz, en carne mortal, por causa nuestra (Sm 1,1-2a).

(7) W. R. SCHOEDEL, *A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* [citado: *Ignatius*] (Philadelphia 1985) 225: «At the same time, however, the docetists apparently spoke of the resurrection positively and probably taught a spiritualized version of it».

(8) SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius*, 225, n. 4: «Ignatius' statement that he believes Christ to be in the flesh 'even' (καί) after the resurrection (3.1) suggests that his opponents could have found support for their docetism especially in the mysterious coming and going of the resurrected Christ».

(9) *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr* [citado: *Letters*] (Roma 1979) 57.

El propósito de Ignacio salta a la vista: los docetas reducían a uno solo los hechos salvíficos del Salvador, a saber, a la venida del Salvador sobre Jesús en el bautismo del Jordán, momento en que Jesús tuvo la gran experiencia del Espíritu. Los demás hechos — incluida la muerte en cruz — no tenían para ellos valor «salvífico» alguno, ya que el Salvador los realizó sólo «en apariencia» (τὸ δοκεῖν). En consecuencia, la experiencia de salvación que les había procurado la irrupción del Espíritu Santo en el momento del bautismo les eximía — según ellos argumentaban — de cualquier compromiso personal para con el prójimo, por cifrarse éste en la creencia de que el Salvador se encarnó realmente (cf. Sm 6,2-7,1). Por eso Ignacio no se limita a subrayar el realismo de los tres hechos salvíficos que la comunidad considera fundantes de su fe, sino que relativiza el bautismo de Jesús, diciendo que «quedó bautizado por Juan, para que se cumpliera por su medio toda la justicia», como un hito más en el «camino de la justicia» que Dios se ha propuesto realizar a favor de los hombres.

Los mismos tres artículos fundamentales del credo, subrayados con el adverbio «realmente», y una nueva relativización del hecho salvífico central del credo doceta, el bautismo del Jordán, se presentan actualmente hacia el final de la Carta a los efesios⁽¹⁰⁾.

Con una triple pregunta retórica, inspirada en Pablo (1 Cor 1,20; cf. v. 19 y Rom 3,27), introduce Ignacio el credo de sus comunidades de Siria:

¿Dónde está el sabio? ¿Dónde el polemista? ¿De qué se glorían los que se dicen 'sensatos'? Porque nuestro Dios, Jesús el Mesías,

- (1) fue llevado por María en su seno, según el plan salvífico de Dios — descendiente de David, pero a la vez fruto del Espíritu Santo —;
- (2) el cual fue dado a luz y
- (3) fue bautizado,
- (4) con vistas a purificar el agua mediante la pasión (Eph 18,1d-2).

El símbolo cristológico de las comunidades de Ignacio constaba de cuatro artículos. No todos los hechos salvíficos, sin embargo, tienen absolutamente el mismo valor. El tercero (3) tiene sólo un valor

⁽¹⁰⁾ La coincidencia no es casual, sino que es debida — según la reconstrucción que propuse de la primitiva Carta a los efesios [Eph*] (*Letters*, 377-378) — al hecho de que la exposición central de dicha carta se encuentra repartida actualmente entre el final de Eph y el principio de Sm.

relativo, pues sólo adquirirá su pleno sentido en el momento de la pasión (4). Los dos primeros y el cuarto — precisa a renglón seguido — constituyen precisamente los tres «misterios clamorosos» que habían sido ocultados al Jefe del orden presente: (1) la virginidad de María, (2) su parto y (4) la muerte del Señor (Eph 19,1). Obviamente, si algo no se le ocultó al Jefe del orden presente, y en particular a los docetas, es el bautismo del Señor (3). Se le ocultó, en cambio, su significado profundo.

Empieza a esclarecerse el sentido enigmático⁽¹¹⁾ de la frase «con vistas a purificar el agua mediante la pasión»: en polémica con los docetas, Ignacio relativiza el alcance del bautismo en el Jordán, esgrimiendo precisamente la pasión, negada por ellos, como instrumento de purificación del agua sensible. ¿En qué consiste la «impureza» del agua? «Puro», para Ignacio, es el que se encuentra dentro del altar / recinto de la comunidad eucarística, mientras que los docetas son «impuros», pues se han autoexcluido de ella (cf. Tr 7,2, cotejado con Sm 7,1). A quienes pretendían que el bautismo de Jesús en el Jordán constituía la única fuente de liberación del mundo material, les responde que Jesús nació y se bautizó⁽¹²⁾ «con vistas a purificar el agua» mediante su pasión y muerte. La liberación y purificación definitiva de toda connotación negativa de la materia — entendiendo por «materia» (ὕλη, πῦρ φιλόυλον, Rom 6,2; 7,2) el falso sistema de valores del «mundo» (cf. Mg 5,2; Rom 2,2; 3,2.3; 4,2; 6,1.2; 7,1), representados por el Jefe del orden presente (cf. Eph 17,1; 19,1; Mg 1,2; Tr 4,2; Rom 7,1; Phld 6,2) — sólo se obtiene mediante la muerte real a todo género de pasiones y ambiciones (cf. Rom 7,2).

2. Contexto próximo: la resurrección avala la realidad de la pasión

Una vez examinado el contexto remoto, que constituye actualmente el encabezamiento de la Carta a los esmirnenses, y de colacionarlo con el final de la actual Carta a los efesios, conviene que nos detengamos a examinar el contexto próximo del pasaje en cuestión. Después de exponer el credo de la comunidad efesina (actualmente,

⁽¹¹⁾ A. ORBE, *La unción del Verbo* (Estudios Valentinianos III) (Roma 1961) 9 y n. 25.

⁽¹²⁾ Como observa atinadamente Orbe, nacimiento y bautismo están perfectamente imbricados en la frase ὃς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη (ibid.).

esmirnense), introduce Ignacio un largo paréntesis, destinado a subrayar el valor salvífico de la pasión del Señor, en cuyo seno se compara en términos joaneos el hecho de ser levantado en lo alto de la cruz con el momento en que se erige mediante la resurrección un estandarte que congregue a todos los creyentes, procedentes tanto del judaísmo como del paganismo, en un solo cuerpo, su iglesia (Sm 1,2b-2,b)⁽¹³⁾.

Una vez cerrado el paréntesis, reasume el hilo de la exposición insistiendo en la realidad de la pasión, pero aduciendo ahora a modo de contraprueba la resurrección del Señor:

Y *realmente* sufrió, de la misma manera que *realmente* se resucitó también a sí mismo (Καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὥς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτὸν) (Sm 2cd).

La repetición de términos relativos a la crucifixión (καθηλωμένον, πάθους, ἔπαθεν [2x]), calificados de reales mediante el adverbio ἀληθῶς (2x) y la locución ἐν σαρκί, junto con la doble mención de las autoridades responsables de la ejecución (Poncio Pilato, romana, y el tetrarca Herodes, judía), son más que suficientes para cerciorarnos de la centralidad de ese hecho salvífico, aspecto éste también muy subrayado (ἀφ' οὗ καρποῦ ἡμεῖς, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα σωθῶμεν), en contexto antidoceta. En consecuencia, de los cuatro artículos del credo efesino (concepción, nacimiento, bautismo y crucifixión), el cuarto constituye la punta de lanza contra los herejes. Los dos primeros intentaban paliar de algún modo el abuso perpetrado por los docetas en la interpretación del hecho — por lo demás incuestionable (según se refleja todavía en el Evangelio de Marcos) — que el ministerio de Jesús haya empezado precisamente después de la experiencia del Espíritu que tuvo éste en el Jordán. El tercero, como ya se ha dicho, queda relativizado al ser considerado como una más entre las múltiples acciones salvíficas emprendidas por Dios a fin de realizar «toda la justicia». A partir del Jordán, Jesús se dispone a llevar a cabo el programa de la «justicia»⁽¹⁴⁾, programa que sellará con su propia muerte.

(13) Los autores, por lo general, llevados por la división en capítulos dividen mal ese pasaje. Su carácter parentético viene sugerido por la oración de relativo (ἀφ' οὗ) que lo encabeza y por la explicativa (γάρ) que lo clausura.

(14) H. BALZ - G. SCHNEIDER, *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart 1980) I, col. 793.

Es sintomático que Ignacio, polemizando con los docetas, se apoye en el hecho que Jesús se resucitó realmente a sí mismo para cimentar la realidad de su pasión. Es la única vez que usa la frase adverbial ὥς καί con valor comparativo⁽¹⁵⁾. La expresión ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτὸν es muy arcaica y próxima, además, a ciertas formulaciones joaneas prácticamente equivalentes (cf. Jn 2,19; 10,17-18)⁽¹⁶⁾ y a la singular fórmula lucana según la cual Jesús entregó en depósito su Espíritu en el momento de morir (Lc 23,46), para recuperarlo de nuevo después⁽¹⁷⁾. De hecho, Ignacio parafrasea la fórmula más primitiva y condensada ἡγέρθη (cf. Mc 16,6; Lc 24,6: cf. Tr 9,2a): ésta hacía hincapié en la acción de despertarse del sueño de la muerte, mientras que la paráfrasis pone el acento en la acción de levantarse. Esta concepción será retenida por los modalistas; tanto es así que Marción corregirá los textos evangélicos — aun cuando no de modo consecuente — en esta dirección⁽¹⁸⁾. Es muy posible que, en tiempos de Ignacio, los docetas abusaran ya de esa formulación para negar que Jesús realmente hubiese muerto y resucitado. De ahí que el propio Ignacio puntualice en la Carta a los tralianos, dictada con anterioridad a ésta, sirviéndose de un inciso parentético, que fue su Padre quien lo resucitó de la muerte (cf. Tr 9,2b; Sm 7,1)⁽¹⁹⁾. Es innegable el tenor antidoceta de esa precisión, tendente a conferir relieve al hecho de que murió realmente.

(15) En Rom 1,1 tiene valor de consecuencia: cf. «Carta d'Ignasi als romans» [citado: *Romans*], en *RevCatTeol* 13 (1988) 281. El interpolador, en cambio, la usa nada menos que 11x.

(16) Cf. BAUER, *AAVV* II, 266; H. SCHLIER, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (Giessen 1929) 69, n. 2 (donde se citan algunos pasajes en que probablemente se verifica también dicha fórmula).

(17) Según El Pastor de Hermas, *Mand.* III 2, el Espíritu ha sido confiado por Dios en depósito (παρὰ καταθήκη) a los hombres, para que éstos se lo restituyan íntegro. Puede verse Orígenes, *Diálogo con Heraclide* 6,14-19 (objeción) y 6,20-8,17 (respuesta de Oríg.). Según los Valentinianos, «El Semen espiritual es depositado en manos del Padre, para que no sea retenido y expoliado por los arcontes en el momento de la pasión (Lc 23,46)» (*El dinamismo trinitario en la divinización de los seres racionales según Orígenes* [Roma 1970] 177).

(18) Cf. A. VON HARNACK, *Marcion* (Leipzig 1924 [1920]) 123.

(19) Véase «Carta d'Ignasi als tralianos» (citado: *Tralianos*), *RevCatTeol* 13 (1988) 44, 47.

3. La formulación central de los docetas

En perfecto estilo de escuela, después de reafirmar su tesis sobre la pasión real del Salvador — Καὶ (reasuntivo) ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν — y de confirmarla con la contraprueba de su auto-resurrección — ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτὸν —, formula primero la tesis contraria de sus adversarios, los docetas — Οὐχ ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν —, a modo de *Sed contra*, para aducir luego las pruebas positivas que deben avalar la realidad de la resurrección. Las cartas ignacianas nos conservan, en estilo directo, la formulación más central del credo doceta:

No como dicen algunos incrédulos: “En apariencia ha sufrido él pasión (Τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι)”. (¡Ellos sí que existen ‘en apariencia’!; y, tal como piensan, les ha de suceder también, pues serán incorpóreos y demoníacos) (Sm 2e-j).

La misma cita literal — no todos los comentaristas la consideran como tal⁽²⁰⁾ — y el mismo mordaz *retorqueo*, jugando con el propio santo y seña de los herejes, se presentan en Tr 10⁽²¹⁾. Los «incrédulos» son precisamente los docetas, pues no creen en el hecho central de la fe cristiana, la pasión y muerte del Mesías. La frase conservada por Ignacio representa la quintaesencia de su cristología. El perfecto πεπονθέναι, tratándose de un verbo de lexema continuo, tiene aspecto *retrospectivo*, puesto que la duración queda en el pasado⁽²²⁾. La pasión de Jesús no fue real sino sólo aparente. Ignacio no tiene ningún interés en referir la teología doceta cifrada en la venida del Salvador sobre Jesús en el Jordán y su retirada en el momento de la pasión. Al contrario, en los tres símbolos antidocetas relativiza de alguna manera el valor soteriológico del bautismo de Jesús (cf. Eph 18,2; Sm 1,1 fin) o simplemente lo silencia en la enumeración de los principales artículos del credo (cf. Tr 9,1).

El docetismo es la primera gran herejía que amenazó seriamente los comienzos de la iglesia naciente. Ignacio no quiere dejarse llevar por la seducción de sus elucubraciones (cf. Tr 5,1-2; 6,2; 7,1; Sm

⁽²⁰⁾ BAUER, *AAVV* II, 238, traduce: «mit den Worten ausdrücken, er habe zum Schein gelitten» y comenta: «Trall. 10 (und ebenso Smyrn. 2) wird als Glaubenssatz der Ketzler angeführt» (239). Puede verse *Tral.lians*, 45.

⁽²¹⁾ Véase *Tral.lians*, 47.

⁽²²⁾ J. MATEOS, *El Aspecto verbal en el Nuevo Testamento* (Madrid 1977) § 247.

6,1) y ni siquiera le parece bien mencionar sus nombres, hasta el punto que preferiría olvidarlos (Sm 5,3). En consecuencia, invita a la comunidad a mantenerse alejada de ellos — cerrando sus oídos a su propaganda (Eph 9,1) y no dándoles acogida (Sm 4,1) — y a no hablar de ellos ni en privado ni en público (Sm 7,2). De hecho, acababan de separarse de las comunidades cristianas fieles a Ignacio (7,1a: εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, en pr.), «pues no reconocen que la Eucaristía sea el Cuerpo de nuestro Salvador Jesús Mesías» (7,1b), y han estado de paso por Efeso (Eph 9,1), probablemente camino de Roma, anticipándosele, a fin de ganarse la comunidad romana para su causa. La condenación de Ignacio ha tenido que ver precisamente con su todavía reciente ruptura con la iglesia de Siria⁽²³⁾. No tiene, pues, nada de extraño que Ignacio aproveche los contactos que ha podido tener con tres de las comunidades asiáticas más representativas, para prevenirlas en sendas cartas frente al proselitismo de la herejía doceta (cf. Tr 8,1; Sm 4,1), de un lado, y frente a las tendencias cismáticas de los judaizantes (cf. Mg 11), del lado opuesto.

4. Tres testimonios fehacientes de la resurrección del Señor

Después del *Sed contra*, Ignacio pasa a exponer punto por punto los tres argumentos en que basa su demostración. En atención a la gran importancia que concedemos al contexto, tanto al remoto y al próximo que hemos estado examinando hasta ahora, como al contexto inmediato en que se encuentra ubicado el que nosotros consideramos como el testigo principal de nuestra encuesta, séanos permitido transcribir debidamente estructurada la entera secuencia. A continuación intentaremos justificar la traducción propuesta.

(Tesis) Y realmente *sufrió*,
de la misma manera que realmente *se resucitó* también a sí mismo.

(*Sed contra*) No como dicen algunos **incrédulos**: “En apariencia *ha sufrido* él *pa-contra* *sión*.” (¡Ellos sí que existen ‘en apariencia’!; y, tal como piensan, les ha de suceder también, pues serán incorpóreos y demoníacos.)

(23) Puede verse nuestro comentario en *Romans*, 283ss.

- (a) Pues yo no solamente lo *he conocido*⁽²⁴⁾ en (un cuerpo de) carne después de la *resurrección*, sino también *creo* que sigue existiendo (en un cuerpo).
- (b) Y cuando *se presentó a los reunidos en torno a Pedro*, les dijo: “Tomad, palpadme y ved que no soy un demonio incorpóreo.” Y, al instante, lo *tocaron* y *creyeron*, una vez se hubieron fusionado a su *cuerpo* y a su *Espíritu*. Por eso también despreciaron la muerte; es más, fueron hallados superiores a la muerte.
- (c) Finalmente, después de la *resurrección*, comió y bebió con ellos, como quien tiene un *cuerpo*, a pesar de permanecer unido al Padre *espiritualmente* (Sm 2c-3,3).

El recorrido ha sido largo, pero era necesario seguirlo, de otro modo la primera (a) de las tres pruebas (γάψ) aducidas por Ignacio contra los docetas nos habría pasado desapercibida o la habríamos fácilmente desactivado, como ocurre en los comentarios.

Prescindiendo del contexto, la frase ignaciana permite benévola-mente dos traducciones y, por consiguiente, dos interpretaciones diversas. Habida cuenta del contexto, pienso que sólo una de ellas es viable. He aquí el tenor literal de la prueba (a): Ἐγὼ γάρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα.

A excepción de Jerónimo y de la Versión anglo-latina (L), se suele traducir tomando el primer καὶ en sentido *adverbial* y el segundo como *conjunción copulativa*. Veamos algunos ejemplos (el subrayado es mío):

«Ego autem post resurrectionem *quoque* in carne eum scio fuisse *et* credo» (Rufino, trad. de HE III 36 de Eusebio).

«For I know *and* believe that He was in the flesh *even* after the resurrection» (Lightfoot, AAFF II,2, 567 = K. Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers* [LCL; London - Cambridge, MA 1959] I, 255 = Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 225).

(²⁴) οἶδα G Eus., εἶδον (*vidi*) L Hier. El perfecto οἶδα, usado en general con sentido de presente («The aor. and pf. are usually supplied by γινώσκω», LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, 483), construido con ac. de persona significa «conocer a alguien»; en nuestro caso, el complemento temporal μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν señala que ese «conocimiento» tuvo lugar en el *pasado*, mientras que la determinación ἐν σαρκὶ precisa que dicho «conocimiento» percepción *visual*. La elección de οἶδα, en vez de εἶδον o de ἔγνωκα, parece debida al propósito de Ignacio de expresar dos aspectos con un mismo lexema: el aspecto temporal de pasado, pero no necesariamente circunscrito a un momento puntual (cosa que sucedería con εἶδον) y el aspecto lexical de conocimiento personal, sensible-inteligible, no reducible a una simple percepción visual (como ocurriría con εἶδον) ni a un simple conocimiento intelectual (cosa que comportaría ἔγνωκα).

«Weiss ich doch *und* glaube fest daran, dass er *auch* nach der Auferstehung im Fleische ist» (Bauer, *AAVV* II, 266 = Bauer-Paulsen, *AAVV* II, 92).

«Ich nämlich weiss *und* glaube, dass er *auch* nach der Auferstehung im Fleische ist» (J. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter* [Darmstadt 1981] 207).

«Pour moi, je sais *et* je crois que *même* après sa résurrection il était dans la chair» (Camelot, *Lettres*, 135).

Todas estas traducciones parten del presupuesto, por lo demás comprensible, de que Ignacio no puede ser testigo ocular de la resurrección de Jesús, cosa que exigiría la traducción que justificaremos a continuación. Esta presunción se funda lógicamente en otro presupuesto, puesto en tela de juicio por Harrison⁽²⁵⁾, pero que todavía se da por descontado entre los comentaristas —, a saber, que Ignacio sufrió martirio durante la persecución de Trajano. Todavía hay una tercera razón que, a modo de círculo vicioso, hacía impensable una datación anterior de las cartas ignacianas, la presencia del episcopado monárquico junto con los otros dos grados de la jerarquía eclesiástica⁽²⁶⁾.

La traducción que he ofrecido más arriba la comparten tanto Jerónimo como la Versión anglo-latina (L). Se funda en la interpretación de los dos καί en sentido *adverbial*:

«Ego vero *et* post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi, *et* credo quia sit» (Jerónimo, *De viris ill.* 16, traducción hecha tomando como base los excerpta conservados por Eusebio, *HE* III 36,11).

«Ego enim *et* post resurrectionem in carne ipsum vidi, *et* credo existentem» (Versión anglo-latina [L], s. XIII).

Para calibrar cuál de las dos líneas de traducción — la doble *adverbial* o la *adverbial-conjuntiva* — refleja más fielmente el pensamiento de Ignacio, además del estudio del contexto remoto y próximo, es imprescindible sopesar las construcciones en que una y otra se apoyan y las conexiones que se establecen con las otras dos pruebas:

1) La construcción Ἐγὼ γάρ, al igual que las otras dos cláusulas encabezadas por Ἐγώ (Rom 4,1) o Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν (Phld 8,1), es ya de

(25) P. N. HARRISON, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge 1936) 83ss.; cf. *Letters*, 140.

(26) En mi monografía consagrada a identificar las cartas auténticas de Ignacio, a pesar de haber llegado al convencimiento de que la condenación de Ignacio nada tuvo que ver con una persecución, ni general ni particular, y de que el concepto de obispo monárquico pertenece a un estrato muy posterior, soslayé sencillamente esta delicada cuestión.

por sí muy solemne. Teniendo presente, además, que Ignacio (a diferencia del presunto interpolador: cf. Eph 21,1; Mg 2; Pol 2,3; 6,1) silencia el pronombre de primera persona en relación con ὀναίμην, περίψημα, ἀγνίζεται (Eph 2,2; 8,1; Mg 12; Rom 5,2; Pol 6,2) o tiende a substituirlo detrás de ἀντίψυχον, περίψημα, παρακαλῶ, ἀσπάζομαι, ἀσφαλίζομαι, ἀγνίζομαι, con frases tales como τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα (Eph 18,1; Tr 13,3; Rom 9,3; Sm 10,2) y τὰ δεσμά μου (Tr 12,2; Sm 10,2), o bien lo relativiza con la adversativa οὐκ ἐγώ, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀγάπη Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Tr 6,1; Phld 5,1)⁽²⁷⁾, dicha construcción adquiere todavía mayor relieve. Ignacio quiere dar mucho énfasis a la frase que encabeza la primera de las tres pruebas (γάρ).

2) Según la primera línea de traducción — adverbial-conjuntiva —, la frase ignaciana rezaría: καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν (...) ὄντα; construcciones similares con καὶ adverbial («también») + εἰμί en Eph 9,2; Tr 5,2; Rom 10,1; Phld 5,2; 9,1 y Sm 6,1. οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω constituirían dos presentes, «sé y creo», pertenecientes, uno, al nivel del saber mentalmente adquirido y, el otro, al de la fe. La recensión larga (g) habría intentado zanjar esta primera interpretación con una de sus típicas amplificaciones (en cursiva): «Yo, *en cambio, no sólo por el hecho de haber nacido él y de haber sido crucificado conozco que ha venido en un cuerpo, sino también* (ἀλλὰ καί) después de la resurrección sé y creo que sigue existiendo en (un cuerpo de) carne». No cabe duda de que, con la adición del primer miembro, el sentido de la frase en cuestión queda circunscrito a un conocimiento de orden puramente intelectual. Ahora bien, teniendo presente que se trata de una *prueba*, ¿qué valor tendría en contexto antidoceta que Ignacio dijera *saber y creer* que Jesús tenía un cuerpo incluso después de la resurrección? Si no admitían que tuviera un cuerpo real en el momento de su pasión, menos lo admitirían después de su presunta resurrección, por mucho que lo repitiera Ignacio.

3) Según la segunda línea de traducción — doble adverbial —, el texto ignaciano deslindaría dos momentos: καὶ (...) αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα; construcciones similares con καὶ... καί, ambos con valor adverbial («no sólo... sino también...»), en Eph 4,2; 7,2; 15,3; Rom 3,2; Sm 11,2. Tanto Jerónimo como la versión anglo-latina tradujeron el doble καὶ por *et... et...* αὐτὸν οἶδα haría refe-

(27) Véase *Letters*, 333.

rencia a una percepción *visual*, de naturaleza *corpórea*, habida «después de la resurrección» y que ha quedado grabada en la mente de Ignacio, «lo he conocido (con mis propios ojos)», perteneciente al dominio temporal de lo histórico; πιστεύω ὄντα, en cambio, haría referencia a una percepción interior por medio de la *fe*, de naturaleza *espiritual*, perteneciente al dominio de lo trascendente, «creo (con los ojos de la fe) que (la sigue) teniendo». Esta doble percepción, οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω, sensible/temporal y espiritual/supratemporal, se repetirá en términos análogos en las otras dos pruebas que aducirá a continuación: (b) ἦψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν; τῇ σαρκί, τῷ πνεύματι; θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ὑπρέθησαν ὑπὲρ θάνατον; (c) συνέφαγεν καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἠνωμένος. A los docetas *incrédulos* (ἄπιστοι) responde como *creyente* (πιστεύω); a su testimonio *de palabra* (λέγουσιν) sobre que Jesús sufrió en apariencia, responde como testigo *ocular* (οἶδα) de su resurrección en un cuerpo de carne.

Aun cuando οἶδα usualmente tiene sentido de presente, su uso como perfecto de εἶδον está suficientemente atestiguado⁽²⁸⁾. Tanto Jerónimo como la Versión anglo-latina lo tradujeron por *vidi*⁽²⁹⁾, haciendo hincapié solamente en el momento puntual en que Ignacio lo vio, mientras que éste usó el perfecto para denotar que aquella acción del pasado seguía viva en su mente⁽³⁰⁾, tanto es así que, a pesar de que ahora no lo puede ver con los sentidos, puntualiza que lo sigue viendo con los ojos de la fe. La traducción que ofrecemos, «lo he conocido» (mejor que «lo he visto»), intenta retener los dos

(28) Ex 3,7-8: Ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου (...) καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα (...) οἶδα γὰρ τὴν ὁδύνην αὐτῶν · καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτούς; Dt 34,6: καὶ οὐκ οἶδεν οὐδεὶς τὴν τάφην αὐτοῦ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης; Ps-Clem., H III 47,2: οὐδεὶς οἶδεν τὴν τάφην αὐτοῦ ἕως τῆς σήμερον; H XIX 2,6: πολλάκις οἶδα τὸν διδάσκαλόν μου εἰπόντα εἶναι τὸν πονηρόν.

(29) No es necesario suponer que Jerónimo y L leyeran εἶδον, como hace LIGHTFOOT, *AAFF* II,2, 294. De los siete códices griegos sobre los que se basa la edición crítica de Eusebio (*HE* III 36,11 Schwartz) — de la cual se sirvió Jerónimo — sólo uno lee εἶδον y todavía en segunda mano.

(30) Cf. J. H. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh 1908 [1906]) I, 109: «The *Perfect* action is a variety by itself, denoting what began in the past and still continues: thus from the 'point' root *weido*, 'discover, descry,' comes the primitive perfect οἶδα. 'I discovered (εἶδον) and still enjoy the results,' i. e. 'I know'».

aspectos implicados en el contexto: la percepción visual «después de la resurrección» y su fijación en la mente de Ignacio.

4) El desempate entre las dos posibles traducciones lo brinda el encabezamiento de la segunda prueba (b). Ignacio la introduce así: καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν. En efecto, una vez eliminado como prueba el primer inciso (a), la transición a la prueba propiamente dicha quedaría muy abrupta, puesto que en lugar de καὶ ὅτε deberíamos esperar ὅτε γάρ⁽³¹⁾. En cambio, si el primer inciso es una verdadera prueba de que Jesús resucitó en la carne, puesto que (γάρ) el propio Ignacio dice haberlo conocido así personalmente, el enlace con el período de apariciones del Resucitado es perfecto («Y cuando se presentó...»). Del hecho que Ignacio haya pospuesto las apariciones a Pedro y a sus compañeros no se sigue necesariamente posterioridad temporal. Ni se afirma ni se niega. Desde su punto de vista, al igual que hizo en Tr 10, la forma más contundente de responder a la afirmación de sus adversarios, quienes decían que Jesús había sufrido pasión en apariencia, era su propio testimonio personal. Nótese las correspondencias, de tipo estructural (τί... / τί δὲ καί... [Tr] // καί... / καί... [Sm]), lexical o de tiempos verbales, así como las constantes inversiones quiásticas entre estos dos pasajes:

Tr 10: Εἰ δέ, ὥσπερ τινὲς (...) ἄπιστοι, λέγουσιν, Τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν (αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν), ἐγὼ τί δέδεμαι (perf.: estado que connota un pasado), τί δὲ καὶ εὐχομαι θηριομαχεῖν; (pr.: momento del que habla).

Sm 2-3,1: Οὐχ ὥσπερ ἄπιστοὶ τινες λέγουσιν, Τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι (αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὄντες) (...). Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα (perf.: estado que connota un pasado), καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα (pr.: momento del que habla).

5) La tercera prueba (c), introducida por μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, enlaza con la primera (a), donde se mencionaba también μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, pero añade un elemento nuevo: después de la resurrección Jesús «comió con ellos y bebió con ellos». Esta tercera prueba está inspirada en una situación similar a la que recuerda Lucas en Hch 10,41. Ignacio comenta: «como quien tiene un *cuero* (de carne)» y puntualiza: «a pesar de permanecer unido al Padre

⁽³¹⁾ T. ZAHN, *Patrum Apostolicorum opera*, II [citado PPAA II] (Leipzig 1876) 85-87; BAUER, *AAVV* II, 266; SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius*, 226 y n. 6.

espiritualmente». Es innegable su interés en poner de relieve las dos dimensiones del Resucitado, *corpórea* y *espiritual*. Desligada de la primera, podría parecer inaudito que Ignacio hable ahora del tiempo subsiguiente a la resurrección de Jesús, como si la escena anterior no perteneciese también a ese tiempo⁽³²⁾. Ignacio ha construido su respuesta a la tesis de los docetas en forma de tríptico, en cuyo centro (b) ha colocado el único logion del Señor aducido en sus cartas y lo ha enmarcado situando en las hojas laterales su propio testimonio (a) y el de los que comieron y bebieron con él después de la resurrección (c).

6) Por lo que hace al logion del Señor, no hay unanimidad entre los críticos sobre el alcance de la cita ignaciana. Zahn deducía, por lo abrupto de la transición, que la cita abarcaba desde καὶ ὅτε hasta ὑπὲρ θάνατον⁽³³⁾. Lightfoot⁽³⁴⁾, con buen criterio, la circunscribió al logion de Señor. En cambio, Schoedel⁽³⁵⁾ duda de si la frase en que se dice «y, al instante, lo tocaron y creyeron» pertenece a su fuente o al propio Ignacio. Nótese que se presentan aquí de nuevo los dos elementos que hemos destacado en (a) y en (b): percepción *táctil*, de naturaleza *corpórea*, y percepción en la línea de la *fe*, de naturaleza *espiritual*. Por eso añade a continuación: «una vez se hubieron fusionado a su *cuerpo* y a su *Espíritu*». Uno y otro comentario pertenecen a Ignacio. Nótese las correspondencias: 1) οἶδα (a), ἦψαντο... κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (b), σαρκικός (c), 2) πιστεύω (a), ἐπίστευσαν κραθέντες... τῷ πνεύματι (b), πνευματικῶς (c). De todos modos, el comentario que añade Ignacio al logion confirma que ha tenido acceso directo a la fuente de aquellos sucesos.

7) Mucho se ha escrito sobre la procedencia del logion aducido por Ignacio. Mientras que Eusebio confiesa que no ha podido locali-

(32) Lo ha notado ZAHN, *IV*A, 600: «Darnach wird, als ob das Bisherige sich nicht auch auf die Zeit nach der Auferstehung bezogen hätte, fortgeführt».

(33) ZAHN, *IV*A, 600: «Durch ein höchst auffälliges καὶ (ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν) ist dieselbe als Citat charakterisirt, und durch die Bemerkung, dass die Apostel in Folge solcher Ueberführung von der Wirklichkeit der Auferstehung Christi über den Tod erhaben gewesen seien, ist sie abgeschlossen».

(34) LIGHTFOOT, *AAFF* II,2, 296. Buen acopio bibliográfico sobre esta difícil cuestión en H. PAULSEN, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien* (Göttingen 1978) 39, n. 54.

(35) SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius*, 227.

zarlo, Jerónimo, que sólo conoce el texto ignaciano a través de Eusebio, dice sin ambages que pertenece a un Evangelio que acaba de traducir (*quod nuper a me translatus est*), es decir, al «Evangelio llamado de los Hebreos», que él mismo ha traducido del hebreo al griego y al latín⁽³⁶⁾, usado frecuentemente por Orígenes; este Evangelio — precisa — se encuentra en la Biblioteca de Cesarea, y le ha sido posible colacionarlo gracias a los Nazareos de Berea de Siria⁽³⁷⁾. Indirectamente, cita el mismo logion como perteneciente al Evangelio usado por los Nazareos en el Comentario a Isaías⁽³⁸⁾. Orígenes, en cambio, lo atribuye a la Predicación de Pedro⁽³⁹⁾. Es posible que Jerónimo haya creído de buena fe que el Evangelio usado por los Nazareos, que él conoce personalmente, sea el mismo que el que se conserva en Cesarea, conocido por Eusebio y por Orígenes, pero que, en realidad, fueran dos obras distintas⁽⁴⁰⁾. Es innegable un cierto parentesco con Lc 24,39.

* * *

De lo expuesto hasta aquí se desprende que la *primera* de las tres pruebas (encabezada precisamente por la enclítica γάρ) debe considerarse al mismo nivel que las dos siguientes. Según esto, Ignacio habría sido testigo ocular de la resurrección del Señor. Sólo así adquiere fuerza probativa, contra los docetas, su testimonio personal de que lo ha conocido *en un cuerpo* (ἐν σαρκί) después de la resurrección. Según nos informa el propio Pablo, los testigos de la resurrección del Señor no deben limitarse a los Doce o a sus parientes. Ignacio, que se desmarca claramente del grupo de Pedro (Εγὼ γάρ — τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον), podría ser un helenista perteneciente a uno de los «más de quinientos hermanos» o al conjunto de «apóstoles/misioneros» a que hace referencia 1 Cor 15,6-7. De hecho, según puede comprobarse a raíz de las reiteradas puntualizaciones que hace Ignacio a los romanos, tralianos y efesios, a pesar de considerarse «apóstol», no quiere presentarse como tal ni impartirles directrices, aten-

⁽³⁶⁾ Jerónimo, *De viris ill.* 2.

⁽³⁷⁾ Ibid., 3.

⁽³⁸⁾ *Com. in Is.* 18, praef.

⁽³⁹⁾ *PArch*, praef. 8.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. LIGHTFOOT, *AAFF* II,2, 294-296; SCHOEDEL, *Ignatius*, 226-227.

dida su actual situación de «condenado» a morir devorado por las fieras en Roma por culpa de las graves luchas intestinas que tuvieron lugar en el seno de su iglesia de Siria (cf. Rom 4,3; Tr 3,3; Eph 3,1)⁽⁴¹⁾.

II. ¿Una lección original conservada por la recensión larga?

A diferencia del pasaje anterior, perteneciente a la recensión media de Rom, aun cuando esta carta por su singular transmisión no fue incorporada a dicha recensión hasta los tiempos de Eusebio (en adelante Rom-z)⁽⁴²⁾, el pasaje que examinaremos a continuación no tiene en su haber ningún aval textual sólido, puesto que se encuentra tan sólo en la recensión larga de Rom (en adelante Rom-g)⁽⁴³⁾. Esta cautela inicial desearía extenderla a todas las conclusiones que se vayan extrayendo, a fin de que no se confunda la argumentación que sigue con la que he desarrollado hasta ese momento.

A la singular transmisión de Rom-z, respecto a las demás cartas que conforman la recensión media, admitida ya por algunos autores⁽⁴⁴⁾, habrá que añadir la también singular transmisión de Rom-g entre las cartas que componen la recensión larga. En efecto, a diferencia de las otras doce cartas, Rom-g, colocada en última posición, no contiene las típicas amplificaciones que tan netamente distinguen estas cartas de sus homólogas de la recensión media. Comparativamente, las amplificaciones que se aprecian en Rom-g son mínimas: 1) buena parte de ellas se presentan ya en los códices griegos (z) de Rom y en el *Martyrium* (M) (3,3: αἰώνιον – αἰώνια G¹HTg (M); 4,3: κοσμικὸν ἢ μάταιον zgM; 5,3: ἀνατομαὶ διαιρέσεις G¹HT (Sm)AmgM; 6,1: τί γὰρ – ζημιωθῇ G¹HTgM; 6,2: ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ zgM; 7,3: ἄρτον – ζωῆς zgM; υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ – Ἀβραάμ zgM, cf. MarIgn 1,1; καὶ ἀένναος ζωῇ zgM); 2) dos son glosas explanatorias

⁽⁴¹⁾ Puede verse nuestro comentario en *Romans*, 295ss.

⁽⁴²⁾ La sigla z representa los cuatro códices, G¹HKT, del texto griego de la recensión media.

⁽⁴³⁾ La sigla g representa los cuatro códices griegos, m v n c, en los que se presenta dicha carta en la recensión larga.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Cf. *Letters*, 21-22; *Romans*, 276. Poco a poco los autores van tomando conciencia de su singular transmisión: así BAUER-PAULSEN, *AAVV* II, 4; C. TREVETT, «Ignatius 'To the Romans' and I Clement LIV-LVI», en *VigCh* 43 (1989) 43-44.

(6,2: Ἰησοῦς γὰρ – πιστῶν ὁ θάνατος γὰρ – ζωή); 3) otras cuatro son glosas, igualmente, introductorias de una cita bíblica (3,3: φιλεῖται – παρ' ἐμοί; 8,1: Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι – Χριστός; 8,2: ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν – ὁ κύριος ὁ καλὸς καὶ); 4) finalmente, prescindiendo de las variaciones estilísticas, de las correcciones debidas a la evolución del dogma — muy interesantes, por cierto — y de las que sirven para esclarecer el sentido del texto — todas ellas muy breves —, quedan sólo por catalogar dos adiciones que muy bien podría haber firmado el propio Ignacio (1,2: ἐάνπερ ὑμεῖς [μὴ]⁽⁴⁵⁾ φείσησθέ μου + προφάσει φιλίας σαρκίνης y 2,2: μεταπεμψάμενος + τῶν ἑαυτοῦ παθημάτων μάρτυρα). Nos ocuparemos de esta última.

Debo confesar que jamás se me habría ocurrido que la recensión larga conservara posibles lecciones originales, si no hubiese realizado un análisis minucioso de Rom-g. La explicación — en caso de aceptarse que Rom-g podría contener alguna lección original — debería buscarse en la transmisión independiente, o por lo menos con contactos sólo tangenciales, tanto de Rom-z como de Rom-g, respecto de las demás cartas. Ni Rom-z ni Rom-g, a pesar de conservar la autopresentación de Ignacio como «el obispo de *Siria*» (2,2: cf. Ps-Mg 14,2!), contienen las típicas interpolaciones sobre el episcopado monárquico y los otros dos grados jerárquicos, presbíteros y diáconos: ni una ni otra hablan del posible sucesor de Ignacio para «la iglesia de *Siria*» (véase Rom-z/g 9,1; la versión latina (l), en cambio, ya lo insinúa: «mementote in orationibus vestris illius qui pro me recturus est ecclesiam quae est in syria»), cuando en otras cartas de la recensión larga no sólo se presenta Ignacio como «el obispo de Antioquía» (Mar insc; Ps-Pol insc), sino que habla abiertamente sobre su sucesor en «la iglesia de *Antioquía*» (Ant 12,1), el diácono Herón (Her 7: παρατίθημί σοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων). El hecho que se las haya integrado, sin más, en una u otra recensión puede inducir a error. En Rom-z no se encuentra ninguna de las típicas amplificaciones sobre la triple estructuración jerárquica de la iglesia que caracterizan la recensión media; en Rom-g, prescindiendo de las amplificaciones que acabamos de reseñar, sólo hay trazas de algún contacto tangencial con las cartas de la recensión larga⁽⁴⁶⁾.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ LS(A)g: om. G¹HKSmAm(C)M, con razón: véase *Romans*, 281.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Así, 1) presencia de determinados términos, ausentes en la rec. media, tales como μονογενής: insc (cf. PsMg 6,1; Tar 6,4; Phil 1,2; 2,2; PsPhld

1. El contexto próximo de Rom 2,2

Dado que los cambios entre una y otra recensión, por lo que se refiere al contexto de Rom 2,2, son mínimos, podemos hablar como si se tratara de una sola. Nos encontramos, en la Introducción de la carta, en un larguísimo desarrollo en que Ignacio trata de justificar con una retahíla de explicativas (siete γάρ seguidos) que sólo podrá realizar su deseo de visitar la comunidad de Roma, después que Dios le haya concedido mucho más de lo que había pedido, pues la podrá visitar como encadenado por la causa del Mesías Jesús, si los cristianos de aquella comunidad desisten de su propósito de interceder en su favor para ahorrarle el suplicio (Rom 1,1-2,2a)⁽⁴⁷⁾. Ignacio ha sido condenado por un delito de sedición política y va a Roma encadenado a diez soldados para que se ejecute allí la sentencia. De hecho, se ha presentado él mismo a las autoridades imperiales de Siria, responsabilizándose de los graves alborotos que habían tenido lugar en el seno de la iglesia de Siria entre cristianos de distintas facciones (cf. Sm 4,2; 11,2-3). Durante su viaje escribe «a todas las comunidades» para decirles que muere «libremente» por la causa de Dios (Rom 4,1). La Carta a los romanos no tiene más objeto que convencer a los cristianos de Roma para que desistan de ejercer influencias a fin de ahorrarle tan terrible suplicio y no traten, indirectamente, de quitarse de encima la deshonra que les podría acarrear la ejecución pública de un personaje tan importante.

2. El obispo de Siria, testigo de los sufrimientos del Mesías

En vez de ejercer influencias en las altas esferas en orden a impedir su ejecución, Ignacio les pide encarecidamente:

4,2; 6,3; PsSm 1,1; Her insc; 7,1; 9,4; PsEph 7,2 [2x]; 16,2; 20,1); πνευματοφόρος: insc (cf. Her insc; PsEph 9,6); παντοκράτωρ: insc (cf. Her insc; Phil 7,1; PsTr 5,2; PsMg 8,2); προφάσει + gen.: 1,2 (cf. Ant 1,2); ὅστερον: 7,3 (cf. MarIgn 1,1; PsMg 11,2; PsEph 7,2); παραιτέω: 8,2 (cf. MarIgn 3,2; Ant 5,2; Phil 12,3); 2) empleo del verbo φιλέω, introduciendo una cita: 3,3 (2x) y 8,2 (cf. Mar 3,3 [2x]; Ant 7,2).

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Por lo que se refiere a la construcción del período, considerado por la mayoría como un anacoluto, puede verse *Letters*, 348 y *Romans*, 281: se trata de un período complejo, debido a exigencias del dictado y, sobre todo, a la gran carga emocional con que Ignacio intenta rubricar su súplica.

no me procuréis otra cosa que ser inmolado a Dios, mientras todavía está preparado el altar,
 de modo que, habiendo formado un coro con el amor,
 entonéis un canto al Padre
 por medio del Mesías Jesús (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ zgM), a saber, que
 al obispo de Siria ese Dios (lo) ha considerado digno de hallarse en
 Occidente,
 después de haber mandado llamar de Oriente
al testigo de sus propios sufrimientos:
 es bueno ir hacia el ocaso (Rom-g: «disolverse, morir») desde el mundo hacia Dios,
 para resurgir yo hacia él (Rom 2,2).

Según se puede comprobar, Rom-g añade después de μεταπεμψάμενος (frecuente en la voz media con sentido activo)⁽⁴⁸⁾ el complemento directo τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παθημάτων μάρτυρα, que en Rom-z no estaba explicitado, a pesar de que por la lejanía de τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας, colocado enfáticamente al principio del inciso anterior, parece que habría debido serlo, por lo menos mediante un pronombre. M[artyrium] lo ha suplido por τοῦτον antes del participio. Camelot ha creído oportuno cambiar la puntuación, a fin de poder disponer de un complemento para μεταπεμψάμενος⁽⁴⁹⁾. Es indudable la semejanza con 1 Pe 5,1, donde Pedro se presenta como μάρτυρα τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (θεοῦ P⁷²) παθημάτων. Teniendo en cuenta que el sujeto de μεταπεμψάμενος es el mismo que el de κατηξίωσεν, a saber, ὁ θεός, y que el participio aoristo connota un tiempo pasado, los sufrimientos de que habría sido testigo ocular Ignacio — ¡a la par que Pedro! — habrían sido los sufrimientos de Dios (con artículo), afirmación inaudita en el contexto dogmático en que se fragua la recensión larga. Tanto es así que los cuatro códices de Rom-g intentan paliarlo con los pertinentes retoques: los códices m v c separan dicho inciso de μεταπεμψάμενος, cambiando καλόν por καλῶν; el códice n, además, añade un καί después de μεταπεμψάμενος. Lightfoot, a pesar de dichas variantes, retiene la lectura que ya Zahn había dado como válida y que se refleja todavía en la versión latina

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, 1115.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ *Ignace d'Antioche. Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe* (Paris 1969) 109-110, separa εὑρεθῆναι («fut trouvé [en lui]») de εἰς δύσιν («l'ayant fait venir du levant au couchant»). Cf., en cambio, Est 1,5; Hch 8,40; LIGHTFOOT, *AAFF* II,2, 202; BAUER-PAULSEN, *AAVV* II, 71.

(1: *praemittens sua(ru)m passion(u)m martyrem bonum etc.*)⁽⁵⁰⁾. El propio Lightfoot comenta que el falsificador ignaciano parece haber admitido la historia, según la cual Ignacio sería el niño que Jesús tomó en sus brazos o, quizás, interpreta mal Sm 3⁽⁵¹⁾.

¿Qué decir de este inciso? Si su tenor es el que aceptan tanto Zahn como Lightfoot y que, de una manera u otra, los actuales códices griegos habrían intentado desvirtuar, ¿de dónde procede? ¿Puede explicarse como una de las típicas ampliaciones de la recensión larga? Ya hemos dicho que ni Rom-z ni Rom-g parecen haber seguido el mismo camino que las restantes cartas de las recensiones media y larga. ¿A quién se le puede haber ocurrido hacer decir a Ignacio que fue «testigo» ocular de los sufrimientos de Dios? La expresión es dura solamente para nuestros oídos posniconos; no, en cambio, para Ignacio, en cuyas cartas afloran expresiones muy similares (cf., p.ej., Rom 6,3; Eph 1,1).

Antes de pronunciarnos, debemos cotejar dicho inciso con otros pasajes pertenecientes a la recensión larga, en los que se habla también de los «sufrimientos del Mesías» y de Ignacio como «testigo», no fuera que nuestro inciso pudiera derivar también de la misma fuente.

1) El Pseudo-Ignacio transforma el pasaje de Eph 11,2, en que Ignacio expresaba su deseo de «participar (μέτοχον) siempre» de las oraciones de los efesios, haciéndole decir que desea «llegar a ser partícipe de los sufrimientos del Mesías (μέτοχον τῶν παθημάτων Χριστοῦ) y ser asociado a su muerte» (Ps-Eph 11,2). Salta a la vista que, a pesar de las semejanzas, se trata de dos situaciones muy diversas. Allí decía Ignacio que Dios lo había «mandado llamar (μεταπεμπάμενος)» de Oriente a Occidente en su calidad de «testigo de sus propios sufrimientos»; aquí, en cambio, «desea llegar a ser (γένοιτό μοι... γενέσθαι) partícipe de los sufrimientos del Mesías».

2) En Ps-Tr 8,2 pide a los tralianos que «sean imitadores de los sufrimientos del Mesías (γίνεσθε μιμηταὶ παθημάτων Χριστοῦ) y de su amor». Como se ve, las coincidencias son también superficiales.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ LIGHTFOOT, *AAFF* III,2, 268: «the MSS read *suam passionem* but this makes no sense and the Greek shows what the original Latin text must have been: the common contraction for *-rum* is easily confused with a simple *m*».

⁽⁵¹⁾ *AAFF* III,2, 268-269.

3) Finalmente en Ps-Pol inscr el propio Ignacio se presenta a Policarpo diciendo: «Ignacio, obispo de Antioquía, así como testigo (ὁ καὶ μάρτυς) de Jesús Mesías». ¿Hace referencia aquí al «testimonio» de Rom 2,2? ¿O bien se considera «testigo» por cuanto va a dar testimonio de Jesús en Roma? La datación tardía de esta carta sugiere más bien retener esa segunda acepción. Por lo demás, lo más probable es que el autor de la recensión larga no haya conocido la existencia de Rom.

Hay un elemento que no ha sido valorado hasta ahora y que podría decidir sobre la autenticidad de ese inciso. La construcción de la frase ignaciana, en la que Dios (ὁ θεός) es sujeto tanto de κατηξίωσεν como de μεταπεμψάμενος, implica que tanto el primer inciso como el presente deben ser referidos a Jesús Mesías, por cuyo medio precisamente la comunidad de Roma deberá entonar un canto al Padre. Al sugerirles Ignacio la «letra» — como quien dice (ὅτι) — del himno cuyo destinatario es el Padre, las acciones atribuidas en él a «ese Dios que ha mandado llamar al testigo de sus propios sufrimientos» obviamente no tiene por sujeto al Padre, a quien se debe dirigir el himno, sino a Jesús por cuyo medio lo deberá entonar la comunidad. Sería éste, precisamente, en su calidad de «nuestro Dios», «mi Dios» o simplemente «ese Dios», quien habría «considerado digno» a Ignacio y quien lo habría «mandado llamar» de Oriente a Occidente como testigo ocular de sus propios sufrimientos. Este innegable arcaísmo es característico — por no decir exclusivo — de las cartas auténticas de Ignacio. Tanto es así que, si no se dice explícitamente que se trata de «Dios» como contradistinto de Jesús Mesías, de «Dios Padre» o simplemente de «el Padre», prácticamente siempre que Ignacio usa el término θεός (con o sin artículo) se refiere a Jesús Mesías⁽⁵²⁾.

Buena prueba de que es anterior a los códices griegos de Rom-g serían los diversos intentos de separar el inciso en cuestión del verbo principal para enlazarlo con el inciso siguiente. Pero, entonces, ¿cómo es que no se presenta ni en los códices griegos ni en las diversas versiones de Rom? La única explicación plausible es que algún copista, en un estadio muy primitivo de la tradición textual ignaciana, entresacó dicho inciso por considerarlo un anacronismo.

(52) Puede verse *Tral.lians*, 29, 38, 49; *Romans*, 280.

* * *

No tiene nada de extraño que, no sólo haya pasado desapercibido el segundo pasaje analizado (la recensión larga tiene — con razón — muy mala prensa), sino que lo mismo haya ocurrido con el primero, perfectamente conservado en la recensión media. Dado el estado actual de las cartas de Ignacio y la serie de precomprensiones que se han ido acumulando sobre su persona durante la dilatada controversia que ha durado medio milenio, era del todo impensable que Ignacio hubiese podido ser testigo ocular de la resurrección del Señor. La creencia de que Ignacio había sido víctima de la persecución de Trajano, su martirio generalmente localizado hacia el año 110, su contacto personal con Policarpo de Esmirna, la ya notable evolución del episcopado, presbiterado y diaconado, que reflejan sus cartas, etc. imposibilitaban anticipar la datación de las mismas. Una vez han caído esas barreras, nada impide catalogar a Ignacio en la generación inmediatamente posterior a los apóstoles.

Las cartas ignacianas proporcionan suficientes elementos para fijar tanto el *terminus ante quem* éstas no pudieron ser compuestas, como el *terminus post quem* ya no tendrían sentido muchas de sus expresiones. Empecemos por el primero. Ignacio habla de «los apóstoles» (Eph 11,2) como el «senado de la iglesia» (Phld 5,1), parte integrante de la historia salvífica que parte de los Patriarcas, «Abraán, Isaac y Jacob», sigue con «los profetas» del Antiguo Testamento, continúa con «los apóstoles» y enlaza con «la iglesia» (9,1); más en concreto, habla de Pedro y Pablo en Roma (Rom 4,3) y de Pablo como bienaventurado, cuyas huellas quiere seguir y cuyas cartas dice conocer (Eph 12,2). Escribiendo a los efesios, «la comunidad celebrísima entre los habitantes superiores» (8,1), pide «tener parte en la herencia de los cristianos efesios que en todo momento estuvieron de acuerdo (συνῆνυσαν) con los apóstoles, fortalecidos por Jesús Mesías» (11,2). Conoce la existencia de «el evangelio» como letra escrita, pues contiene el «cuerpo/carne de Jesús» (Phld 5,1), como contradistinto de «los archivos» que contenían las Escrituras antiguas (8,2), muy superior a Moisés y a los Profetas, «pues contiene la venida del Salvador, nuestro Señor Jesús Mesías, su pasión y su resurrección» (Phld 9,1-2; Sm 7,2). La única cita literal, sin embargo, que se encuentra en las cartas auténticas pertenece a un evangelio hoy día considerado apócrifo, según ya se

ha visto⁽⁵³⁾. Finalmente, conoce muy bien que los efesios son lugar de paso de los que van hacia Dios por el martirio (Eph 12,2). En una palabra, el *terminus ante quem non* es posterior a la generación de los apóstoles, pero les va a la zaga.

El *terminus post quem non* es todavía más difícil de fijar. Sin embargo, la presencia de una serie de expresiones y de hechos, así como la ausencia de otros pueden contribuir a despejar el camino para su fijación. Son los siguientes: 1) el afloramiento de una cristología ascendente y arcaizante (Eph 7,2; 17,1; 18,2-19,3; Mg 8,2; Tr 9,2; 11,2; Rom 3,3b; Sm 2; 4,2f); 2) la comprobación de una ecle-siología mínimamente organizada (Rom insc; 2,2; 9,1); 3) centrada en la reunión de la comunidad eucarística (Eph 4,2; 13,1; Mg 7,1e-2; Phld 4ab); 4) el estallido de gravísimas luchas entabladas en el seno de las comunidades de Siria entre las corrientes de tipo doceta (Τὸ δοκεῖν: Tr 10,1; Sm 2,1; 4,2), de tendencia espiritualista e innovadora (cifrada en el πνεῦμα: Tr 5,1-2; Sm 6,1), y las de cariz judaizante (Mg 8,1; 10,2; Phld 6,1), de tendencia legalista y tradicional (cifrada en la σάρξ: Mg 1,2; 8,1; 9,1; Phld 8,2); 5) la separación todavía reciente de los docetas (ἄρεσις: Eph 6,2; Tr 6,1-7,1.2ab; Sm 6,2-7,1) y las actitudes cismáticas de los judaizantes (σχίζων: Phld 3,3); 6) el paso por Efeso de propagandistas docetas camino seguramente de Roma (Eph 9,1); 7) la pacificación de la iglesia de Siria gracias a las oraciones de las otras iglesias, con la consiguiente recuperación de su cuerpo comunitario tan deteriorado por las luchas intestinas (Phld 10,1a; Sm 11,2-3; Mg 14); 8) la experiencia de Jesús por parte de la comunidad (Eph 6,2; 15,2; Rom 8,2) y la permanencia de la profecía (Rom 7,2); 9) la escatología inminente (Eph 11,1; Mg 5,1), etc. Todos estos indicadores nos advierten que nos encontramos ante una situación muy próxima a los hechos de Jesús, de cuya muerte y resurrección el mismo Ignacio podría haber sido testigo ocular.

Facultat de Teologia de Catalunya
Diputació 231
08007 Barcelona

Josep RIUS-CAMPS

⁽⁵³⁾ No se puede demostrar que haya dependencia literaria alguna de los evangelios sinópticos (H. KÖSTER, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* [TU 65; Berlin 1957] 60).

SUMMARY

Jerome and the Anglo-Latin version of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch interpreted the passage of IgnSm 3,1 in the sense that Ignatius was an eye-witness to Jesus' resurrection. Modern authors translate this differently, understanding that Ignatius died during the persecution of Trajan. However, both the remote and the immediate contexts require that it be considered a clear proof that it came from Ignatius himself against the Docetists. In the fuller recension, which is of doubtful authority, another passage is preserved (IgnRom 2,2) which may well be authentic, considering the independent transmission of IgnRom with respect to the other letters both in the intermediate and in the fuller recensions. In this case, Ignatius would have been a witness to the Lord's passion as well.

The Dishonoured Master (Luke 16,1-8a)

The parable of the "unjust steward" in Luke 16,1-8a has been a constant source of puzzlement for exegetes and homelists alike. The reasons for this are obvious: The story ends with the "lord" praising the steward, but it is not entirely clear whether the lord of v. 8a is the master of the parable or Jesus. But why would either praise apparently immoral activities? Does the parable sanction such actions or some aspect of the manager's activities? Or is the point the master's obliviousness or indifference to the fraud which has been perpetrated upon him? Are the manager's actions really fraudulent? Is it the master's actions or character that are in view here, or the manager's? In the ninety years since the publication of Adolf Jülicher's monumental study on the parables of Jesus there is hardly a consensus on any single aspect of this parable⁽¹⁾.

It might seem presumptuous, therefore, to dream of solving such an intractable problem. I will argue, however, that the parable takes for granted on the part of the auditors an awareness of important economic and social data having to do with loans and tenancy contracts and with the role and obligations of household managers. The "economic world" of the parable must be reconstructed if it is to be intelligible to post-Enlightenment and post-industrial readers. Even more importantly, the parable presumes an appreciation of the pivotal cultural values of honour and shame, and the essentially vertical and stratified character of ancient Mediterranean society. By applying insights from ancient economics and cultural anthropology to the parable, I will argue that what is at stake is the master's honour, not the steward's character.

(1) A. JÜLICHER, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Tübingen 1910; repr. Darmstadt 1976). JÜLICHER (II, 511) argued that the parable counsels "not the wise use of wealth, but resolute use of the present as a precondition for a happy future..." (my translation).

I. The Limits of the Parable

Luke's context shows that it took quite some effort for him to preserve the parable. The saying in v. 9, "And I tell you, make friends for yourselves from unjust mammon so that when it should fail, they will receive you into the eternal tents", echoes the steward's plan for being received into the households of his master's debtors once he has been stripped of his stewardship (v. 4). But the introduction of the dichotomy between the earthly and the eternal into the horizon of discourse alters the sense of the parable. It has the effect of relegating all of the actions in the parable, including the striking praise of the steward by the master, to the status of strangely opaque and complicated mundane illustrations of much simpler spiritual verities. Besides, the implication of v. 9 that wealth is both a serious threat to Christian faith if it is mishandled, and a means of benefaction and reconciliation is so congenial to Lukan editorial interests that it is quite likely that v. 9 is a Lukan commentary on v. 4.

The sayings in vv. 10-12 divert attention yet further away from the parable and its conclusion by exploiting the dichotomy of earthly and spiritual introduced in v. 9, and by developing the maxim that faithfulness (or unfaithfulness) in lesser matters is an indication of the same in weightier matters. The conclusion, "if then you were not trustworthy with unrighteous mammon, who will trust you with what is genuine, and if you were not trustworthy with what belonged to another, who will give you something for yourselves?" (vv. 11-12), transforms the parable in 16,1-8 into a *negative example story*. But it does so at the expense of ignoring the master's praise of v. 8a. With v. 13, which Luke has taken from the Sayings Gospel Q (Luke 16,13 = Matt 6,24), the transition is complete: Enslavement to wealth, and hence all of the actions described in vv. 1-8a, are pronounced inimical to the service of God and with that, the troubling and graphic immorality of the parable has been contained successfully.

As most commentators now recognize, the domestication of the parable has already begun with v. 8b. Like the sayings which follow, v. 8b limits the prudence commended in v. 8a to the dealings of "the children of this age" with their own and introduces "the children of light" for whom, presumably, this sort of "prudence" is not

quite appropriate⁽²⁾. Moreover, the saying evokes a social division — Christians *versus* outsiders — which, in spite of the occurrence of the term “children of light” at Qumran⁽³⁾, is imaginable only in a post-Easter setting.

More vexing is the problem of the master’s praise in v. 8a. An impressive number of critics hold that v. 8a too should be regarded as interpretation, not part of the parable proper. Joachim Jeremias, for example, finds it “hard to believe that the *kyrios* of v. 8 refers to the lord of the parable: how could he have praised the deceitful servant?”⁽⁴⁾. This allows Jeremias to read *ho kyrios* in v. 8a as a reference to *Jesus* whom Luke often calls “the Lord”, and to treat the situation of 16,1-7.8a on the analogy of Luke 18,1-5.6 where the phrase *eipen de ho kyrios* in v. 6 introduces *Jesus’* commentary on the parable of the unjust judge (18,1-5).

Jeremias’ key argument is one of narrative probability; the analogy of 18,1-5.6 serves as secondary support. Yet as Joseph A. Fitzmyer rightly observes, the occurrences of *ho kyrios* in vv. 3 and 5, where it clearly refers to the master, makes it difficult to understand the *kyrios* in v. 8 differently when there is no intervening indication of a change of narrative perspective⁽⁵⁾. Brandon Scott points out that in 18,1-5.6; 12,35-37 and 19,12-28 Luke is careful to give clear

(2) See C. H. DODD, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (rev. ed.; London 1961) 17; J. JEREMIAS, *The Parables of Jesus* (3d rev. ed.; London 1972) 46; J. A. FITZMYER, “The Story of the Dishonest Manager (Lk 16:1-13)”, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula 1974) 167-168 [originally published in *TS* 25 (1964) 23-42]; D. O. VIA, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia 1967) 156; B. B. SCOTT, “A Master’s Praise: Luke 16,1-8”, *Bib* 64 (1983) 174-175.

(3) See FITZMYER, “Dishonest Manager”, 167, n. 10.

(4) JEREMIAS, *Parables of Jesus*, 45. See also R. BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh; Oxford 1963) 175-176; W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin ¹⁰1984) 318; A. M. HUNTER, *The Parables Then and Now* (London 1971) 100-101; J. D. CROSSAN, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (San Francisco 1973) 109; W. SCHMITHALS, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare 3,1; Zürich 1980) 167; D. E. OAKMAN, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day* (Studies in the Bible and early Christianity 8; Lewiston, N.Y. 1986) 150.

(5) FITZMYER, “Dishonest Manager”, 166-167. Similarly, SCOTT, “A Master’s Praise”, 175.

linguistic clues that a change of speaker has occurred⁽⁶⁾. In 18,6 this is signalled by the introduction of a new character, *ho kyrios*. By contrast, *ho kyrios* in 16,1-8a is one of the two principal characters of the story itself. Hence, Jeremias' analogy of 18,1-5.6 is a false one and, more importantly, the argument from narrative probability militates against the segregation of v. 8a from the preceding verses⁽⁷⁾.

Two further considerations tell against treating v. 8a as Jesus' commentary on the story. Dan O. Via doubts that an appended interpretive comment would have survived during oral transmission⁽⁸⁾. Even more telling is his observation on the structure of the narrative: without v. 8a, there is no indication that "the actantiel subject attained his object"⁽⁹⁾, and hence from a structuralist perspective, the narrative is incomplete.

If v. 8a provided the conclusion to the story⁽¹⁰⁾, we are faced with a "narrative swerve". One might expect the defrauded master to punish the manager, adding the appropriate threats to anyone else who might dare to contemplate the same. Or, conceivably, the master might recognize his steward's managerial skills and reinstate him. No one is really prepared for what actually occurs in v. 8a. This is surely the way in which the parable delivers its message, but it remains to be specified how this message is delivered, and what it is.

The dominant line of scholarly interpretation focuses upon the prudence of the steward⁽¹¹⁾. If there is an element of surprise in the

(6) SCOTT, "A Master's Praise", 176.

(7) FITZMYER, "Dishonest Manager", 167: "To interpret 'the master' as a reference to Jesus is unexpected, and it is really read back into the first part of the verse only by reflection on its second part and the change of subject in v. 9".

(8) VIA, *The Parables*, 156.

(9) D. O. VIA, "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach", *Semeia* 1 (1974) 124.

(10) Thus B. T. D. SMITH, *The Parables in the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge 1937) 110; L. J. TOPEL, "The Injustice of the Unjust Steward: Lk 16:1-13", *CBQ* 37 (1975) 218; I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids 1978) 620; G. SCHNEIDER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (ÖTKNT 3/2; Gütersloh-Würzburg 1984) 331; J. DONAHUE, *The Gospel in Parable* (Philadelphia 1988) 163.

(11) For a survey of the variety of interpretations, see H. PREISKER, "Lc 16,1-7", *TLZ* 74 (1949) 85-92; TOPEL, "Unjust Steward" and MARSHALL,

parable, it is the manager's innovative actions in vv. 5-7 which, as the conclusion shows, turn out to be successful in saving him. It is normally assumed that the steward is dishonest and that the locus of his dishonesty is not his antecedent behaviour but the fraudulent actions of vv. 5-7. The master's praise is not praise of his fraud, but of his prudent or resolute actions under crisis, and the point of the parable becomes an illustration of the kind of resolve and decisiveness required of those who respond to the proclamation of the Kingdom. This view is found both among those who ascribe all of vv. 1-8a to the parable⁽¹²⁾, as well as those who hold that Jesus is speaking in v. 8a⁽¹³⁾.

Several objections have been raised against this reading. Donahue observes that if the steward were dishonest, he would have no grounds for hoping that his former clients would receive him. Who would hire a dishonest manager, especially if it might jeopardize one's relationship with his former employer⁽¹⁴⁾?

There is yet a deeper problem. The steward's "prudence" is manifest in the blatant attempt to save himself. To argue that Jesus encouraged in his listeners such crass self-interest is difficult to reconcile with other arguably authentic sayings such as Luke 6,27-28.29.30; 14,26.27 where self-interests are to be set aside. The usual solution is to see this appeal against the background of a proclamation of the crisis constituted by the coming (or present) kingdom or to connect this parable with the "parable" of the debtor (Luke 12,58-59). Yet nothing in the parable evokes an apocalyptic situation. The crisis experienced by the steward is not precipitated by a returning master and the rendering of accounts hardly requires any

Luke, 616-617. A significant (though in my judgment, flawed) treatment of the parable is also found in J. BREECH, *The Silence of Jesus: the Authentic Voice of the Historical Man* (Philadelphia 1983) 101-113.

⁽¹²⁾ A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh 1901) 380; J. M. CREED, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London 1930) 201; SMITH, *Parables*, 110; TOPEL, "Unjust Steward", 219; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 616; R. H. STEIN, *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia 1981) 111; SCHNEIDER, *Lukas*, 331; G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids 1986) 202-203.

⁽¹³⁾ DODD, *Parables of the Kingdom*, 17 (Dodd also considers the possibility that v. 8a concluded the parable); JEREMIAS, *Parables*, 182; HUNTER, *The Parables*, 100; SCHMITHALS, *Lukas*, 167.

⁽¹⁴⁾ DONAHUE, *Gospel in Parable*, 164.

allegorizing to be intelligible⁽¹⁵⁾. As Crossan observes, the structure of this parable does not lend itself to an apocalyptic interpretation⁽¹⁶⁾. Indeed, it is hard to imagine that the original auditors, whose most proximate concerns were likely to have been debt, taxes and the size of the next harvest, would have come to this "apocalyptic" interpretation without considerable coaching.

It is salutary to remember that the original audience of this parable consisted not only of Jesus' immediate followers as Luke has it (16,1a) but a wider audience composed mostly of non-elite persons — peasants, artisans, petty officials — and perhaps the occasional scribe or Jerusalem elite. That such persons would be able or even inclined to distinguish between the virtue of prudence, considered abstractly, and the fraud in which it is embedded, is most unlikely. The traditional reading is made even more difficult by the grammatical observation that the steward is not praised "because he was prudent" (*hoti ēn phronimos*) but "because he acted prudently" (*hoti epoîesen phronimōs*). The "prudence" of the action is inextricably connected to the substance of the act. And this in turn forces us back to the question of the master's praise.

II. The Economic Assumptions of the Parable

A very different solution to the dilemma of the master's praise has been proposed by J. D. M. Derrett and Joseph Fitzmyer. Both exonerate the steward of any wrongdoing, at least as far as the narrated action is concerned. This involves a complicated set of as-

⁽¹⁵⁾ The phrase *apodidonai ton logon* (v. 2) occurs elsewhere as a metaphor for God's judgment (Matt 12,36; cf. 25,19; Rom 14,12; 1 Pet 4,5) but always in contexts which make clear its eschatological sense. Nothing in the context of Luke 16,1-8a suggests an eschatological sense; the phrase is used in the perfectly ordinary sense of "rendering account" as is also the case in Acts 19,40.

⁽¹⁶⁾ J. D. CROSSAN, "The Servant Parables of Jesus", *Semeia* 1 (1974) 46: "The motif of the departing and returning master fitted perfectly into the apocalyptic expectation of the coming Son of Man in the primitive community... But this is subverted in [the Unmerciful Servant, Unjust Steward, Servant's Reward and the Tenants] in which the reckoning begets unexpected action, and that is a different eschatology".

sumptions about the nature of the financial transactions of the steward.

There are two versions of this explanation. Derrett argues that the story presupposes that the steward had been making usurious loans which the master probably had not expressly sanctioned⁽¹⁷⁾. When the steward found himself about to be dismissed, he rebated to the debtors the interest component of the loans. Although this technically deprived the master of property due him, the usurious component violated God's law and was thus tainted. Besides, the master had little recourse, since the steward, as a legal agent, was acting within his competence. The master's decision was to "praise", i.e., ratify the action of his steward and thus to represent himself to the public as a benefactor⁽¹⁸⁾. The point of the parable for Derrett is twofold: even "worldly people" sometimes recognize that action in accordance with divine law is the right course of action, and in any event, they act with a single-mindedness which should serve as a lesson for others⁽¹⁹⁾.

Fitzmyer's solution is a slight variation⁽²⁰⁾. Like Derrett he argues that the steward was making usurious loans, but assumes that the interest component constituted the steward's own profit. Hence the steward's action in no way injured his employer, since he was merely foregoing *his own* profits. The master could then afford to praise or ratify his actions because they did not infringe on his own income and because they seemed prudent ways of ingratiating himself with prospective new employers⁽²¹⁾. The parable thus becomes a good illustration of someone acting prudently in respect to wealth just as the Christian is expected to "grasp the dramatic situation of

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. D. M. DERRETT, "The Parable of the Unjust Steward", *Law in the New Testament* (London 1970) 48-77; repr. of *NTS* 7 (1960-61) 198-219.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁽²⁰⁾ FITZMYER, "Dishonest Manager", 161-184.

⁽²¹⁾ Fitzmyer's argument is accepted by P. PERKINS, *Hearing the Parables of Jesus* (New York-Ramsey 1981) 167-168; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 614; S. FREYNE, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Wilmington 1980) 182 and H. MOXNES, *Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia 1988) 140-141.

the kingdom and the crisis that it brings into the lives of men”(22).

It might be objected that there is no explicit reference to the interest component of the debt. Yet the sophistication of these two suggestions lies in their claim to have uncovered the assumptions which any ancient listener would make, but which would be indiscernible to a modern reader. It is necessary, nevertheless, to examine these suggestions more carefully.

It should be noted against Fitzmyer that both the story and what we know of loan receipts indicate that the steward's action would result in a loss for the master, not the steward. As several have pointed out(23), the steward inquires as to how much the debtors owe *his master* (vv. 5.7). Moreover, if a generalization from contemporary loan documents from Egypt is permitted, the contract is always framed as an agreement between the lender and the borrower even when, as is frequently the case, the lender's agent actually negotiated the contract. There is *never* any indication of how, if at all, the agent is to be remunerated: the sum to be repaid is to be delivered to the lender “or his representatives”. Halvor Moxnes has suggested that the steward was simply foregoing his commission on the loan(24). However, literary sources suggest that there was no uniform means for the remuneration of household managers(25). For

(22) FITZMYER, “Dishonest Manager”, 178.

(23) F. MAASS, “Das Gleichnis vom ungerechten Haushalter: Lc 16,1-8”, *Theologia Viatorum* 8 (1961) 179; SCOTT, “Master's Praise”, 177; STEIN, *Parables of Jesus*, 109.

(24) MOXNES, *Economy*, 140. K. E. BAILEY, *Poet and Peasant* (Grand Rapids 1976) 93, asserts gratuitously that the steward would have received his remuneration “under the table” and from the payment of a fee at the time of the contract. This relies on a misreading of *m.B. Bat.* 10.4 which, as the context clearly indicates, concerns *notaries* or *scribes* rather than agents.

(25) The precise mechanism for the remuneration of household agents is very unclear, since most ancient authors considered the topic too sordid for discussion. Roman freedmen, who often assumed the position of a household manager for their patron (Cicero, *Republic* 1.61), may have worked for wages or as part of the *operae* due their master in return for the *beneficium* of manumission. But others seem to have worked for their keep and a more casual type of remuneration. It is possible that financial agents worked for a portion of the profit but our sources are rarely forthcoming on these details and never indicate a consistent pattern. See S. TREGGIARI, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic* (Oxford 1969) 142-161.

the audience to conclude that a "commission" or a portion of the interest was at stake would require an explicit reference in the parable to that fact. Based on contemporary loan practices and the data given in the parable, the only reasonable assumption is that the manager's actions would strike at the master.

As to the main contention of Derrett and Fitzmyer, it is not even clear that the parable envisages the situation of a loan. The debtors might just as well be *tenants* who have rented a plot and an olive grove from the master at a fixed rate of return, rather than on the basis of half-shares⁽²⁶⁾. Derrett argues that tenancy is not at issue, since the tenant technically "owes nothing at all until the time for payment (for example, the harvest) arrives"⁽²⁷⁾. To this Kenneth Bailey rightly retorts that Derrett mistakenly supposes that the steward is *collecting* the debt: "The amounts are not *due* until harvest, but they are indeed *owing* from the day the agreement is signed"⁽²⁸⁾. In any case, however, the sums in question are relatively high and militate against both loans for seed grain for smallholders and rent from small rental tracts⁽²⁹⁾. One hundred cors of wheat (1,115 bushels) is far too large an amount to be seed grain and would represent a half-share rent for almost 200 acres, which is perhaps twenty times the size of an average family plot⁽³⁰⁾. One hundred baths of oil (about 3,500 litres) probably represents a very large olive grove⁽³¹⁾, all the more so if it is assumed that the tenant retains half of the total yield. This means that the master is dealing either with large-scale renters or wholesale merchants. But the parable simply does not allow the audience to determine which is the case.

⁽²⁶⁾ Both forms of rental are attested. See, e.g., *P. Mich.* 12.634 (25/26 CE; Arsinoite nome): seven arourae of land at a yearly rent of forty artabae of wheat.

⁽²⁷⁾ DERRETT, "Unjust Steward", 67, n. 7 (emphasis original).

⁽²⁸⁾ BAILEY, *Poet and Peasant*, 93 (emphasis original).

⁽²⁹⁾ Loans for seed grain from Egypt are normally in the range of 4 – 6 artabae or 4.5 – 6.7 bushels, enough for 2.5 – 3.7 seeded acres. For seed requirements, see Columella, *De Re Rustica* 2.9.1; Varro, *De Agricultura* 1.44.1-2 and A. C. JOHNSON, "Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian", *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (ed. T. FRANK) (Paterson, NJ 1959) II, 59.

⁽³⁰⁾ For the basis of these calculations, see OAKMAN, *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*, 61-62.

⁽³¹⁾ JEREMIAS, *Parables*, 181, estimates a grove of 146 trees.

The suggestion that the steward reduced the usurious component of the loan implies that the interest rate for the loan of oil was 100% (v. 6) and 25% for the wheat (v. 7)⁽³²⁾. Derrett, citing Billerbeck, declares that the latter percentage corresponds to the "traditional rate of interest on a genuine loan of wheat"⁽³³⁾. It does not. Numerous loan documents from Egypt indicate that the standard rate for wheat and barley was 50%. In fact the interest rate for commodities is customarily stated with the stock formula "I, NN, have received from NN the sum of x artabae, including the added half (*meta tês hēmiolias* or *syn hēmiolia*), which I will repay ..."⁽³⁴⁾.

⁽³²⁾ Loan agreements from Egypt normally called for repayment in kind in the case of commodities and coin for loans of money. Interest was included in the ostensible amount loaned. Hence "I acknowledge to have received from you three measures of wine, which I will repay" meant that two had been received but three would be repaid. Most agreements also included a section dealing with the possibility of default, stating penalties (often monetary), and giving the lender the right of execution on the property of the borrower.

One frequently encounters in commentaries on this parable statements to the effect that the practices of repaying debts in commodities rather than in coin, and of including the interest in the ostensible amount loaned was a Jewish practice to circumvent the biblical laws against usury. This is hardly the case as even the most fleeting acquaintance with papyrus documents from Egypt would reveal.

⁽³³⁾ DERRETT, "Unjust Steward", 68.

⁽³⁴⁾ *Hēmiolia* is attested in the sense of "50% interest" from the third century BCE (*P. Cairo Zenon* 59414) to the fourth or fifth century CE (*P. Amh.* 147). See, e.g., *P. Oxy.* 1040 (wheat, 225 CE); *P. Tebt.* 110 (wheat, 92 or 59 CE); *CPJ* 411 (barley, 3 CE); *P. Columbia* 7.176 (wheat, 325 CE). Jerome gives the same rate for grain, wine and oil: "solet in agris frumenti et milii, vini et olei ceterarumque specierum, 'usuram' exigi sive, ut appellat sermo divinius, 'abundantiam', verbi gratia ut hyemis tempore demus decem modios et in messe recipiamus quindecim, hoc est amplius partem mediam" (*Comm. in Ezechielem Prophetam* 6.18.5-9 = CChr 75:240.431-435). On the "added half" see N. LEWIS, "The Meaning of *syn hēmiolia* and Kindred Expressions in Loan Contracts", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 76 (1945) 126-139.

The formulae *meta tês hēmiolias* and *syn hēmiolia* also appear in connection with loans of currency, but it is normally found in the section dealing with penalties for default: *P. Oxy.* 1471 (81 CE); *P. Oxy.* 1641 (68 CE); *P. Tebt.* 818 (174 CE). Although higher figures are occasionally attested (e.g., Brutus' charge of 48% on a loan, see Cicero, *Letters to Atticus* 5.21.10-12; 6.1.5-7), 12% is the more usual rate. See T. FRANK, "Rome and Italy of the Republic", in FRANK, *Economic Survey* I, 352; JOHNSON, "Roman Egypt", in

What this means is that the audience of the parable would *not* assume that the steward was reducing the loan by the interest component: the amount of the reduction is not consistent with current interest rates⁽³⁵⁾.

Both Derrett and Fitzmyer are required to make the assumption that the steward normally contracted for interest-bearing loans, but that he (or his master) found it convenient on this occasion to attend to the prescriptions against usury in Deut 15,7-8; 23,20-21; Exod 22,2 and Lev 25,36-37. This involves a final set of problems. It presupposes, without any evidence, that both the alleged lender and his debtors were Jews. And it presupposes both that Jewish lenders in general felt at least occasional compulsion to observe the biblical injunctions on usury *and* that the audience of Jesus' parable would recognize this. Neither assumption is secure. We have from both Egypt and Palestine loan agreements involving Jews (*CPJ* 411; *Mur* 18) which state the rate of interest with not so much as a hint of embarrassment, and the latter even stipulates that the loan is to be repaid "even if it is in a sabbatical year", an apparent allusion to the *prosbol* or something very much akin to it⁽³⁶⁾. The parable of the entrusted money in Q (Luke 19,12-27) likewise assumes that the

FRANK, *Economic Survey* II, 450 and n. 58 and P. W. PESTMAN, "Loans Bearing no Interest?", *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 16-17 (1971) 8. A rate of 20% is attested in one of the two Murabba'at loan documents (*Mur* 18 = *DJD* II, 100-104); in *Mur* 114 the rate is stated as that "(established) by the edict", presumably 12%.

⁽³⁵⁾ DERRETT, "Unjust Steward", 69-70, justifies the 100% figure for the oil loan not with Palestinian or even Mediterranean evidence, but with generalizations from Indian evidence. However, Jerome's statement (above, n. 34) suggests that the rate was the usual fifty percent. FITZMYER, "Dishonest Manager", 182, suggests that this rate is exorbitant and "should not be pressed too literally, for high figures are characteristic of Jesus' parables" but is strangely silent on the figure for wheat. Apart from the fact that this parable does not give the appearance of the hyperbole seen, for example, in the stated yields of the Sower, Fitzmyer's point, if true, would sabotage his own thesis: the auditor could be expected to understand that interest was at issue only provided that *realistic* interest rates are indicated; otherwise the listener would assume that something else had happened.

⁽³⁶⁾ See M. GOODMAN, "The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt", *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin* (ed. G. VERMES - J. NEUSNER) (Totowa, NJ 1983) = *JJS* 33 (1982) 422-423.

third servant could and should have invested his money with money lenders in order to receive interest (vv. 22-23)⁽³⁷⁾.

Derrett's case is built largely upon retrojecting the decisions of *m. Baba Metzia* and related talmudic commentary into the first century *and* upon the assumption that the Pharisaic predecessors of the rabbis were in a juridical position to enforce whatever decisions they may have taken. At this point, Jacob Neusner's observation that he is unable to trace *any* of the Mishnah's division *Neziqin* ("Damages") into the period before the wars (i.e., before 70 CE) should be sobering news⁽³⁸⁾. So too are the conclusions of Martin Goodman important. Goodman has persuasively argued that a contributing cause of the first revolt was an unbalanced economy caused by over-capitalized Jerusalem elite and an increasing debt burden on the peasantry⁽³⁹⁾. That debt was a serious problem is suggested by the fact that one of the first actions of the revolt in 66 CE was the destruction of the debt archives (Josephus, *Bell.* 2.427). Goodman notes that it is rather unlikely that the rich lent money "out of kindness alone"⁽⁴⁰⁾, especially given the evidence of extremely weak so-

⁽³⁷⁾ Josephus' discussion of usury (*Ant.* 4.266-270) limits the prohibition of interest to loans of food and clothing to those who lack either one. Thus for Josephus the issue is not interest in general, but the further economic disadvantage of those who are already marginalized.

⁽³⁸⁾ J. NEUSNER, *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago 1981) 62.

⁽³⁹⁾ M. GOODMAN, *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge - New York 1987) and "The First Jewish Revolt".

⁽⁴⁰⁾ As PESTMAN, "Loans Bearing No Interest?", 14-29, has shown, even the so-called *atokos*-loans frequently found in Egyptian papyri were not necessarily interest-free. While a minority may have been goodwill loans among friends or family members and bearing no interest (*P. Lond.* 3.1203 [114/13 BCE]; *P. Rein.* I [114/3 - 104/3 BCE]), the majority either bore interest in some non-monetary form (e.g., the right to use the debtor's property) or, as appears to be most frequently the case, included the interest along with the principal (p. 27). Hence *atokos*, meaning "with no additional interest", distinguishes this set of loans from *entokos* loans, in which interest is added to the principal stated on the contract. It is quite likely that genuinely interest-free *atokos* loans were used in Palestine, probably between friends and kin. There are no grounds, however, for supposing that the transactions in Luke 16,1-8a were of this variety and, indeed, no grounds for deciding (in the event that they *were* loans) whether they belonged to the (interest-bearing) *atokos*-class or the *syn hēmiolia* type (pace J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel Ac-*

cial ties between the lending elite and peasant debtors. In addition he points out that the institution of the *prosbul*, which probably belongs to this period, was to the obvious advantage of the elite since it secured loans which might otherwise have been cancelled during the sabbatical year⁽⁴¹⁾. These observations are key for establishing how Jesus' audience would understand his parable. The sums mentioned in the parable — if they were loans — would simply be assumed to include the customary interest component. It is doubtful that the audience would consider this to be anything out of the ordinary and hence they would scarcely presume, quite apart from the problem of loan rates mentioned above, that the reduction was made in compliance with laws which were in fact being ignored, if indeed they ever did apply to general commercial borrowing.

In sum, the attempts to exonerate the steward and account for the master's praise by positing a last-moment compliance with the laws of usury fail both because the narrative would have had to include much clearer indications of this if a first-century audience were to discern that intent, and because it currently contains elements which point *away* from that meaning. Although it is unclear whether the steward was dealing with tenants or borrowers, several facts are certain. First, the debtors involved are not poor sharecroppers, but either large farmers or wholesalers. Second, a Palestinian audience would not suppose that either usury or the manager's commission was the focal point of the story. And finally, the natural implication of the story is that the steward's actions are injurious to the master's interests.

III. Masters, Stewards and the First-Century Listener

Even if the conclusions of Derrett and Fitzmyer are flawed, they contribute a key methodological point. To understand the parable adequately, it is necessary to reconstruct the world of the listener,

cording to *Luke X-XXIV* [AB 28a; Garden City, NY 1985] 1100-1101 n. 6).

⁽⁴¹⁾ GOODMAN, "First Jewish Revolt", 422; *Ruling Class*, 56-58. While it is unclear whether the rabbinic discussion in *m. Šeb.* 10.3-7 can be traced to Hillel, the evidence of Mur 18 (55/56 CE) shows clearly that something akin to the *prosbul* was available at least by the time of Nero.

and this includes not only "religious" but social and economic aspects. Brandon Scott has advanced this project by examining the social codes embedded in the story⁽⁴²⁾. The meaning of the parable emerges in the dialectic between the narrated elements and the cultural expectations which the parable deliberately evokes.

As Scott rightly notes, the characterization of the man as "rich" in v. 1a is redundant⁽⁴³⁾: that he has a steward and that he has debtors on the scale indicated in vv. 5-7 make his status quite clear. But to say that he is rich is to evoke a social code, probably that of the peasantry, in which the rich are expected to behave in ways which are inimical to the peasants' interests⁽⁴⁴⁾. Whether the steward would be seen negatively is not yet clear. As a member of the rich man's household he might well share in the hatred directed at the rich. But the manager was the representative of the household with whom the peasant would be most likely to have direct dealings, and there were undoubtedly fair and generous agents, just as there were unscrupulous ones.

Although commentators regularly observe that *diaballō* means "to bring charges with hostile intent", it is usual to assume that the charges mentioned in v. 1b were true and that the word is not being used in its ordinary sense⁽⁴⁵⁾. Fitzmyer infers from the fact that the manager did not try to defend himself that the charges were true⁽⁴⁶⁾.

(42) SCOTT, "A Master's Praise", 179-185.

(43) SCOTT, "A Master's Praise", 179-180.

(44) Particularly helpful are the observations of G. FOSTER on the idea of "limited good" in peasant societies ("Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good", *American Anthropologist* 67 [1965] 293-315). In such societies, "all of the desired things in life such as land, wealth, health, friendship and love, manliness and honor, respect and status, power and influence, security and safety, exist in finite quantity and are always in short supply, as far as the peasant is concerned..." (296, emphasis original). Anyone who is rich and increases his wealth does so at the expense of others. This implies that the characterization of the man as "rich" would set at least one part of Jesus' audience against him.

(45) E.g., PLUMMER, *Luke*, 382; W. FOERSTER, "*Diaballō, diabolos*" *TDNT* II, 71.

(46) FITZMYER, "Dishonest Manager", 171, n. 19. Similarly, DONAHUE, *Gospel in Parable*, 164. BREECH, *Silence of Jesus*, 106, interprets the steward's lack of response and the passivity expressed in v. 3 to mean that he is not only incompetent, but selfish and irresponsible, "that he has no aware-

Scott rightly insists, however, that a clearer indication of a departure from the ordinary sense of the word must be given. The fact that the steward is given a summary judgment *without* a hearing is not tantamount to an admission of guilt, but on the contrary confirms the listeners' view of the rich man as capricious and unfair⁽⁴⁷⁾.

More is at stake here. If the guilt of the steward were to be taken for granted, as the usual interpretation has it, it would be enough to begin with the statement, "There was a rich man whose steward was scattering his goods". Instead, the charges are framed quite indirectly, with an aorist passive. The indirect nature of the charges is reiterated by the master's own statement in v. 4, "what is this I hear about you?" *Others* have told him. And this is the crucial point: Others are saying, whether correctly or not, that the steward is "scattering" the man's possessions. At this point the story engages the social codes which have to do with the master's *honour*. He has in his employ someone whose actions, whether real or imagined, cause him to be seen as a master who cannot control his *oikos*, and whose agent is either a fraud or an incompetent. He looks like a fool in front of his peers.

As the recent work of Bruce Malina has shown, ancient Mediterranean society was an honour-shame culture in which the approbation of the public and especially of one's social peers is an intrinsic aspect of status. Subordinate persons were seen to be embedded in the honour of the dominant male, and actions of subordinates — sons, daughters, wives, agents — would threaten the social standing of the *paterfamilias*⁽⁴⁸⁾. It was also a culture in which honour ultimately counted more than wealth. It is true that various persons expended much effort in amassing spectacular fortunes; but it is also striking that the same persons often engaged in benefactions on an equally spectacular scale⁽⁴⁹⁾. This is intelligible only if wealth was

ness whatsoever of contributing to the situation in which he now finds himself".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ SCOTT, "A Master's Praise", 181-182.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ B. MALINA, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta 1981) 25-50.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Augustus' *Res Gestae* provides an outstanding example of such benefaction. See in particular F. W. DANKER, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis 1982).

considered as a means to acquire honour rather than an end in itself.

If honour was measured in part by the degree of respect and loyalty shown a householder by his *oikos* and in part by his reputation among his peers, much more is at stake in the parable than the master's money; his social standing has been challenged⁽⁵⁰⁾. Malina observes that "every social transaction that takes place outside one's family or outside one's circle of friends is perceived as a challenge to honor. . ." ⁽⁵¹⁾. Even though the steward belongs to the master's *oikos*, the matter of his alleged incompetence (or dishonesty) has entered the public forum. If it had been brought to the attention of the master by, say, another of his household, the narrative would have taken the course charted by Matt 18,23-35: charges (18,32), followed by judgment and punishment (18,34). But the accusation has come from the outside. This means that it is not the *steward* who is on trial, but the *master*, and the court is the court of the opinion of the public and his peers. To be seen as unable to control and to command the respect of one's dependents, especially one's children, clients and agents is to incur a grave social stigma.

In this situation, the master has only one real option: to dismiss the steward. The truth of the charges is immaterial since the master does not have access to a public inquisitorial process in which such charges could be examined, and besides, such a process would only prolong the shame⁽⁵²⁾. Punishment of the offender is a secondary matter; recovery of honour is the central problem. His only course is to dismiss the steward and to do so quickly. Thereby he acquits

⁽⁵⁰⁾ See, e.g., Marcenes' speech to Augustus: "Now it is both right and necessary for you to honour the good who are associated with you, both your freedmen and the rest; for this course will bring you credit and a large measure of security. They should not, however, acquire excessive power, but should all be rigorously kept under discipline, so that you shall never be brought into discredit by them (*hyp' autōn diablêthênai*). For everything they do, whether good or ill, will be set to your account, and you will yourself be considered by the world to be of a character akin to the conduct which you do not object to in them" (Dio Cassius 52.5-6).

⁽⁵¹⁾ MALINA, *New Testament World*, 33.

⁽⁵²⁾ MALINA, *New Testament World*, 39, notes that even when judicial action is possible, it brings no satisfaction to honour because the act of going to court only demonstrates one's vulnerability, and only aggravates the dishonour by publicizing it.

himself of the charge of the inability to control his inferiors and recovers some of the loss of face.

The narrative implicitly recognizes this in the steward's silence, to which both Fitzmyer and Scott draw attention, and also in the steward's haste, expressed by the *taxeōs* of v. 6: The steward knows that a defense would be beside the point, and that if he is to save himself, he must act quickly. It is of course true that the auditors of Jesus' story might have had mixed reactions. Some of the non-elite might still sympathize with the plight of the steward and continue to suppose that the charges were not true. Others might assume the opposite and think the master justified. But no one would doubt that *in order to recover standing, the master had to act decisively*.

Now that the parable's central problematic has been exposed, we may proceed to the second (vv. 3-7) and final (v. 8a) sequences. The steward decided to reduce the face value of the contracts — either loans or tenancy contracts⁽⁵³⁾. This is not belated compliance with the biblical laws of usury but outright fraud. Crossan has drawn attention to the irony of parable: "The cleverness of the steward consisted not only in solving his problem but in solving it by means of the very reason (low profits) that had created it in the first place"⁽⁵⁴⁾. I would prefer to say that what begins as unsubstantiated charges threatening the master's control in his own house and therefore his honour too, has ironically escalated to massive proportions: the "scattering" of the master's goods (and honour) is occurring on a monumental scale⁽⁵⁵⁾.

How would the actions of the steward be evaluated? Scott argues that the steward's confession that he is too weak to dig and

⁽⁵³⁾ FITZMYER, "Dishonest Manager", 176, n. 26, is probably correct that the parable envisages the *rewriting* rather than the *falsifying* of the accounts. Since many contracts were framed as first person accounts of the debtor's or lessee's agreement with the lender or lessor (e.g., *CPJ* 411; *Mur* 18; *Mur* 114; *P. Columbia* 7.176; 7.179; *P. Oxy.* 1631), rewriting in the debtor's/lessee's hand (presuming that she or he was literate, which is far from common!) would be relatively simple.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ CROSSAN, *In Parables*, 110.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ JEREMIAS, *Parables*, 181, calculates the reduction of the two named commodities at 1,000 denarii. Since the parable speaks of summoning the master's debtors "one by one", presumably more than two are involved and the details of the two loans are provided *exempli gratia*.

ashamed to beg distances the reader from the steward, thus preparing for the picaresque actions of vv. 5-7⁽⁵⁶⁾. But Donahue is more likely correct: the audience would hardly expect a person belonging to the managerial sector to beg or dig⁽⁵⁷⁾. The statement evokes sympathy rather than contempt. To "admit" that one is not a labourer or a beggar is no shame; it only points to the steward's social status. He will deal with the problem in a way that befits that status.

With respect to the steward's course of action, two questions can be asked. Would the manager's actions be likely to help him? The answer is, Yes. The act of reducing the size of debts is an act of benefaction. In the moral and political economy of antiquity, this act imposed obligations on the recipients; he had in effect become a patron and they his clients. Under these circumstances, the expectation that he might be received into their households was a reasonable one⁽⁵⁸⁾.

Those interpreters who locate the point of this parable in the steward's decisive actions implicitly assume that his actions constitute the surprising element. This raises the second question: how surprised would the audience be by the manager's course of action? If we are permitted to judge from Roman sources, the possibility that an owner might be defrauded by a clever manager was never far from his mind. The Elder Pliny suggests that an overseer (*vilicus*) should be as clever as his master but not know it⁽⁵⁹⁾. Cato's advice on hiring an overseer for an agricultural estate expressly considers the possibility of unauthorized lending, unapproved purchases and

⁽⁵⁶⁾ SCOTT, "A Master's Praise", 183. BREECH, *Silence of Jesus*, 106, likewise assumes that the admission characterizes him as a "sponger" who does not intend to hire himself out to others as a steward but merely to live in the houses of his former clients. Breech's view presupposes a too restrictive interpretation of *oikos* in v. 4, which should be construed as "household" in the socio-economic sense rather than the purely locative sense of "house".

⁽⁵⁷⁾ DONAHUE, *Gospel in Parable*, 164.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ MOXNES' assumption (*Economy*, 141) that the debtors are smallholders not only conflicts with the size of the debts involved, but is inconsistent with the manager's hopes: he is not looking for lodging but for employment in the households of these debtors. Needless to say, a smallholder is not likely to need the employ of a manager.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Pliny, *Historia naturalis* 18.7.36: nobis satis sit dixisse quam proximum domino corde esse debere et tamen sibimet ipsi non videri.

the hiding of the accounts⁽⁶⁰⁾. Cicero had bad luck with managers: he accused Philotimus his *dispensator* of everything from poor judgment and partisanship to theft⁽⁶¹⁾. Interestingly, his relationship with Philotimus seems to have worsened as the rift with his wife Terentia widened. This is probably because Philotimus was a freedman of Terentia and his primary obligations were to her as his benefactor. It is not especially surprising that under such circumstances, a *dispensator* would not act in the best interests of his employer. Nor should we be too surprised when the manager in Luke 16, who has just lost his patron, begins to make other arrangements. From the point of view of the master, the actions of the manager are precisely what Cato feared, for they would reflect badly upon the master's competence and upon his honour. But from the manager's perspective and that of the audience of the parable, the manager's actions are prudent, almost predictable.

The parable has evoked the powerful spectre of the threat to the honour of an influential man, a threat that is exacerbated by his steward's "settling of accounts". The narrative expectations conjured up by this story point in only one direction: The master must recover his honour, undoubtedly at the expense of the steward. But here the narrative swerves. Instead of fulfilling the audience's expectations, the master praises the steward for his act. By this he shifts attention from his own damaged honour to the apparent success of his now-disembedded steward. He honours with praise a social inferior and one who has threatened his reputation as master of his house. In this sector of ancient society, social relations were characterized by verticality; a threat to honour endangers one's position. Yet the master seems to ignore his own honour and his own endangered state. This is tantamount to "laughing" at his own honour and at the honour-shame codes with which the story has operated.

The genius of the parable consists in bringing about narrative closure, but only at the expense of fracturing the cultural codes and

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Cato, *De Agri Cultura* 5.3-4. Similarly, Columella, *De Re Rustica* 1.8.1-7. Columella expressly warns that a failure of oversight on the part of the owner can result in the land getting a bad name (*ita fit ut ... ager saepius infametur*) (1.7.7).

⁽⁶¹⁾ Cicero, *Atticus* 10.9.1; 6.4.3; 6.5.1; 7.3.1. See TREGGIARI, *Roman Freedmen*, 263-264.

expectations of this listener. It celebrates the master's "conversion" from the myopia of his society's system of ascribed honour. The listener is induced — if only momentarily — to doubt the absoluteness of this pivotal value, not by a polemical broadside but by pure narrative surprise.

Can this reading be corroborated outside of this parable? The implication of the foregoing analysis is that Luke 16,1-8a should not be regarded as one of the "servant" parables, but instead should be compared with Great Supper (Q/Luke 14,16-24). Here too an influential man, to judge from the economic standing of the first guests, invites his peers to a banquet, one of the approved social locales for the display and acquisition of honour. Either through a bizarre coincidence (in the Gos. Thom. 64) or through a deliberate snub (in the Q version) none can attend. Quite unexpectedly he turns to those who, as Luke rightly perceives (14,12-14), cannot reciprocate or show him honour in the way he initially expected. The narrative demands and achieves closure, but in doing so it steps outside the social codes evoked at the beginning of the story. The "Prodigal Son" functions analogously. It represents the father as not only welcoming a son who has dissipated his father's property and hence dishonoured him, but as welcoming and honouring him in a way that shocks the cultural codes of the audience⁽⁶²⁾. The Good Samaritan uses a folkloric triad to effect narrative closure, but in doing so it deliberately creates a challenge to prevailing assumptions about Samaritans and about the absoluteness of current social boundaries. All four parables — the Unjust Steward, the Feast, the Prodigal Son and the Samaritan — challenge by their narrative structure the cultural codes which undergird various sorts of social exchange but by their very nature erect a wall against other persons. The Q saying preserved in Luke 6,29 provides a non-parabolic example of Jesus' rejection of retaliatory vengeance which, as is obvious, derives its impetus from the social codes of honour and shame.

* * *

⁽⁶²⁾ See the outstanding account of this parable in DONAHUE, *Gospel in Parable*, 154-156.

To read the parable of the unjust steward or, as I prefer to call it, the Dishonoured Master, as a narrative which first evokes and then challenges the social codes of honour and shame has two important consequences. First, this reading interprets the story as a true *parable*, not merely as an example story designed to illustrate a virtue like decisive action under crisis or prudent disposition of money. This is, of course, not to imply that Jesus did not tell example stories. The force of the last twenty years of parables research, however, suggests that from the standpoint of form, a significant number of Jesus' stories display narrative peculiarities which do not lend themselves to easy exemplary application⁽⁶³⁾. Second, like the Good Samaritan, the Feast or the Vineyard Workers, to take only three examples, this parable evokes and then surprises not only the immediate narrative expectations of the listener, but more importantly, it engages and then challenges by inversion or burlesque, elements of the auditor's *symbolic universe*: the security of the social and ethnic boundaries between Jews and Samaritans, or the legitimate expectations of the commensurability of achievement and compensation, or the self-evident appropriateness of insisting upon one's honour⁽⁶⁴⁾.

Faculty of Theology
University of St. Michael's College
Toronto School of Theology
Toronto, Canada M5S 1J4

John S. KLOPPENBORG

⁽⁶³⁾ See now B. B. SCOTT, "Essaying the Rock: The Authenticity of the Jesus Parable Tradition", *Foundations and Facets Forum* 2,1 (1986) 3-53.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ I would like to express my appreciation to Wendy J. Cotter for various kindnesses.

SOMMAIRE

La parabole de l'intendant malhonnête ne peut pas être lue comme un exemple qui illustrerait la vertu d'un agir résolu face à une crise; elle représente plutôt une parabole au sens propre, parabole où ce n'est pas le gérant qui se trouve au centre, mais le maître lui-même. L'histoire doit être comprise sur le fond des normes culturelles de comportement relatives à l'honneur et au déshonneur reçu, que l'usage habile du style narratif porte en un premier temps à la connaissance, afin de les remettre ensuite en question.

Psalm 121: A Prayer of a Warrior?

The first part of this study examines the structure and poetry of Ps 121. The second part argues for an earlier history of the psalm as a "Prayer of a Warrior". The third part traces the poem's path from a "Prayer of a Warrior" to a pilgrimage hymn among the "Gradual" psalms or "Songs of Ascent"⁽¹⁾. Finally, a "Conclusion" reflects briefly on the implications of the plurality and ambiguity revealed in the psalm's language and imagery.

I. The Structure and Poetry of Ps 121

A number of translators and commentators agree in dividing the psalm into four sets of two verses each: vv. 1-2.3-4.5-6.7-8⁽²⁾. This division yields four strophes of approximately equal length, with

(¹) On this group of psalms, each of which bears the title *šîr hamma'ălôt* (except Ps 121; cf. below), see C. C. KEET, *A Study of the Psalms of Ascent: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary upon Ps 120-134* (London 1969); A. A. ANDERSON, *The Book of Psalms* (NCB; London 1972) II, 47-48; L. SABOURIN, *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (New, enlarged, updated edition; New York 1974) 9-11; H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen I: 1-59* (BKAT 15/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn ⁵1978) 17-18; E. BEAUCAMP, *Le Psautier: Ps 72-150* (SB; Paris 1979) 233-255; G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi: Commento e attualizzazione* III (101-150) (Lettura pastorale della Bibbia 17; Bologna ²1985) 502-509. On the anomalous title *šîr lamma'ălôt* in Ps 121,1, see M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms III: 101-150* (AB 17A; Garden City 1970) 200.

(²) Among the versions, note the RSV, NAB, the Chicago Bible (= *The Old Testament: An American Translation* [Chicago 1927]), the *New Jerusalem Bible* (London 1985). The commentators would include J. CALÈS, *Le Livre des Psaumes Traduit et Commenté* (Paris 1936) II, 450; A. COHEN, *The Psalms: Hebrew Text and English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* (London 1945) 420-421; E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms* (Dublin 1964) 567; *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. R. C. FULLER) (London 1969) 489; L. JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'Homme*,

syllable counts of 29, 29, 32, and 32 syllables respectively (following the masoretic vocalization). At least two indications support this division into four strophes. First, the initial verse of each of the four sets of verses thus contains the name of a different part of the body: v. 1 “my eyes”, v. 3 “your foot”, v. 5 “your right hand”, v. 7 “your soul (neck)”⁽³⁾. Second, the two verses which constitute each strophe are joined by anadiplosis, i.e. the last word of the one verse is repeated at the beginning of the next verse: vv. 1-2 *‘ezrî/‘ezrî*, vv. 3-4 *‘al-yānûm šômērekā/hinnēh lō’-yānûm*, vv. 5-6 *yēmînekā/yō-mām* (paronomastic), vv. 7-8 *yišmōr ‘et-napšekā/yhwh yišmōr*⁽⁴⁾.

Artur Weiser notes that the psalm’s rhetorical power makes a “deep impression” on the reader or hearer; it communicates an “inward stability” and “the calm and comforting assurance of an unshakable trust”⁽⁵⁾. These qualities are due in large measure to the tight unity and to what one might characterize as the “totalizing” rhetoric of the psalm which conjures up in the space of its eight verses a miniature universe ruled and controlled by the benevolent Guardian (cf. *šmr* “to guard, watch” in vv. 3.4.5.7 [2x].8) and Creator God (*‘ōšēh*, v. 2), a universe from which “all evil” (*kol-rā’*, v. 7)⁽⁶⁾ has been banished and into which the reader or hearer is invited to enter and live day by day (cf. v. 8 “Yahweh will guard your going and your coming from now and forever”).

Psaumes 101 à 150 (Gembloux 1979) 415; RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 524.

⁽³⁾ For *nepeš* “throat, neck”, see DAHOOD, *Psalms* III, 56. On poets’ use of the names of parts of the body as a poetic and structuring device, see A. R. CERESKO, *Job 29–31 in the Light of Northwest Semitic: A Translation and Philological Commentary* (BibOr 36; Rome 1980) 17–18. DAHOOD, *Psalms* III, 113, for example, notes “the frequency of names of parts of the body” as a “curious feature” of Ps 110.

⁽⁴⁾ For further discussion of the rhetorical device of anadiplosis, see W. G. E. WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSS 26; Sheffield 1986) 208–213 (referred to by WATSON as “terrace pattern”); W. BÜHLMANN – K. SCHERER, *Stilfiguren der Bibel: Ein kleiner Nachschlage-werk* (BibB 10; Fribourg 1973) 25–26. Both SABOURIN, *The Psalms*, 10, and KRAUS, *Psalmen* I, 17, discuss the frequent occurrence of anadiplosis in the “Songs of Ascent”.

⁽⁵⁾ A. WEISER, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (OTL; London 1962) 745.

⁽⁶⁾ COHEN, *The Psalms*, 421, notes concerning *kol-rā’* in v. 7, “The addition of all points to the comprehensiveness of the Divine protective power”.

The psalmist achieves this tight unity and "totalizing" effect through a number of rhetorical devices. First, although the psalm appears to be in the form of a dialogue with a shift in speakers between vv. 1-2 and vv. 3-8, in fact it is a single voice that is being heard throughout. Hermann Gunkel holds that the psalmist here has borrowed a mode of expression from the temple practice, the request for God's help by a suppliant and the promise by the priest of God's assistance. In this psalm, however, that exchange of question/request and answer takes the form of an interior dialogue⁽⁷⁾. Thus, "... the 'you' whom he addresses (in vv. 2-8) is his own soul"⁽⁸⁾.

An inclusio between the first and last strophe forms another indication of the poem's tight unity. The repetition of the verb *bw'* "to come, enter" in conjunction with the double use of the preposition *min* in an A-B-A pattern (the only occurrences of either word otherwise in the psalm) frames the entire poem: *mē'ayin yābō'* ... *mē'im*, vv. 1-2//*mikkol* ... *ūbō'ekā* ... *mē'attā*, vv. 7-8⁽⁹⁾. Besides the employment of anadiplosis to join the two verses within each of the four strophes, the psalmist effects an interlocking among alternate strophes as well. The discussion below of Ps 121 as a "Prayer of a Warrior" (II. A) mentions the connection between "mountains" (or "Mountain") in the first strophe (vv. 1-2) and "shadow" in the third strophe (vv. 5-6), and N. W. Lund has recognized a link between the second (vv. 3-4) and fourth (vv. 7-8) sets of verses: "There is a parallelism in the reference to 'the foot' which shall not be

(7) H. GUNKEL, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (31911), as quoted by O. EISSFELDT, "Psalm 121" in *Stat crux dum volvitur orbis* (FS D. Hans Lilje; Berlin 1959) 10 (= O. EISSFELDT, *Kleine Schriften* III [eds. R. SELLHEIM - F. MAAS; Tübingen 1966] 495).

(8) Ibid. RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 523 comments, "The poet ... answers himself by means of a psychological doubling of himself...". See also J. F. CRAGHAN, *The Psalms: Prayers for the Ups, Downs and In-Betweens of Life* (Background Books 2; Wilmington 1985) 59; F. NÖTSCHER, *Die Psalmen* (Echter-Bibel; Würzburg 1947) 253; L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, *Treinta Salmos: Poesía y Oración* (Madrid 1986) 345.

(9) J.-N. ALETTI - J. TRUBLET, *Approche poétique et théologique des Psaumes: Analyses et méthodes* (Paris 1983) 32, note only the inclusio formed by the repetition of the verb *bw'* in vv. 1 and 8.

moved (v. 3) . . . and the 'going out' and 'coming in' alluded to in v. 8"⁽¹⁰⁾.

The poet further reinforces the unifying effect of the inclusio and interlocking of strophes by the repetition of certain words. Elsewhere we have pointed out examples of biblical authors using a tenfold (or half of that, i.e. fivefold) repetition⁽¹¹⁾. In this psalm, the second person singular suffix *-kā* "you, your" is repeated ten times (vv. 3 [2x].5 [3x].6.7 [2x].8 [2x])⁽¹²⁾, while the divine name *yhwh* occurs five times (vv. 2.5 [2x].7.8)⁽¹³⁾. The three instances of *šmr* "to watch, guard" as a finite verb (vv. 7 [2x].8) in the latter part of the psalm balance its threefold participial usage as a divine title (vv. 3.4.5) earlier in the poem.

Finally, the inclusio formed by the repetition of *bw'* and *min* in an A-B-A pattern in the first (vv. 1-2) and last (vv. 7-8) strophes focuses on a centerpoint for the psalm, the phrase *yhwh šömërekā* "Yahweh is your Guardian", at the beginning of v. 5. 58 syllables precede the phrase and 58 follow it⁽¹⁴⁾. As well, the phrase consists of three of the key repetitions in the psalm: *yhwh* (repeated five times), *šmr* (repeated six times, three each as a participle and a finite verb), and the second person singular suffix *-kā* (repeated ten times).

⁽¹⁰⁾ N. W. LUND, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte* (Chapel Hill 1942) 109. Cf. P. AUFFRET, *La sagesse a bâti sa maison. Etudes de structures littéraires dans l'Ancien Testament et spécialement dans les psaumes* (OBO 49; Fribourg-Göttingen 1982) 451-452. See also RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 524.

⁽¹¹⁾ Ps 105, for example, repeats the word *'ereš* "land, earth" ten times and *dābar* "word", *'ebed* "servant, slave", and the divine name *yhwh* five times each; cf. A. R. CERESKO, "A Poetic Analysis of Ps 105, with Attention to Its Use of Irony", *Bib* 64 (1983) 27-29.

⁽¹²⁾ This is also pointed out by RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 521.

⁽¹³⁾ Note also that the psalm refers to the deity a total of ten times: five times using the name *yhwh* plus five further times employing three different titles (*'ōšēh* "Creator" v. 2, *šēl* "Shade" v. 5, *šömër* "Guardian" [3x; vv. 3.4.5]).

⁽¹⁴⁾ On the use of syllable counting as a help in determining structures in Hebrew Poetry, see D. N. FREEDMAN, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: Studies in Early Hebrew Poetry* (Winona Lake 1980), in the "Index" under "syllable counting" (355).

The author of Ps 121 makes extensive use of merismus as another of the tools of his "totalizing" rhetoric⁽¹⁵⁾. Four obvious examples of this device, the very purpose of which is to suggest comprehensiveness or totality, appear in the poem: "heaven and earth" (v. 2); "sun"/"moon" (v. 6); "by day"/"by night" (v. 6); "your going and your coming" (v. 8). Also, a more subtle form of merismus is implicit in the contrast between "guarding, keeping watch" (*šmr*) and "sleeping, slumbering" (*nwm*, *yšn*) in the second strophe (vv. 3-4), and in the concluding line of the poem, "from now unto eternity" (v. 8). Finally, as noted above, the author names a part of the body in the first verse of each of the psalm's four strophes. This listing of the parts of the body contributes to the encompassing and totalizing nature of the psalm's rhetoric⁽¹⁶⁾. In a kind of extended merismus, the poet explicitly includes even the singer's entire physical body under God's benevolent shelter within that secure microcosm created by the artistry of the psalm's language⁽¹⁷⁾.

(15) BÜHLMANN and SCHERER, *Stilfiguren der Bibel*, 79, comment: "Merismus is related to metonymy. A whole is described by two or more of its essential, often polar, elements (*merismos* 'piece, part')"; e.g., "heaven and earth" = the entire world, "young and old" = all people. See further J. KRAŠOVEC, *Der Merismus im Biblisch-Hebräischen und Nordwestsemitischen* (BibOr 33; Rome 1977); id., "Merism-Polar Expression in Biblical Hebrew", *Bib* 64 (1983) 231-239; WATSON, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 321-324. M. O'CONNOR, "The Pseudo-Sorites in Hebrew Verse", *Perspectives on Language and Text* (FS F. I. Andersen; [eds. E. W. CONRAD and E. G. NEWING] Winona Lake 1987) 239, comments on biblical poetry's "claim (or is it desire?) to know everything"; "... it seeks to include everything, cover everything, enact and encode everything". He points to merismus as one of the preferred strategies to achieve these goals.

(16) RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 525, also comments on the naming of the four body parts in the psalm. He sees it as indicative of the poem's "somatic symbology".

(17) This naming of a different part of the body in each strophe of the psalm may provide a clue to how the psalm was used in the cult. One could imagine that the mention of a different part of the body in each of the four strophes signaled an appropriate gesture involving that body part by the singers and/or dancers "performing" the psalm in a cultic drama. On the cultic drama or "liturgical mime" and the psalms, see the comments of R. E. MURPHY, *The Psalms, Job* (Proclamation Commentaries; Philadelphia 1977) 13; B. W. ANDERSON, *Out of the Depths: The Psalms Speak to Us Today*

II. Ps 121 as a "Prayer of a Warrior"

The present setting of Ps 121 among the "Songs of Ascent" has directed most contemporary interpreters to focus on the poem's meaning and function as a song connected with pilgrimage. A number of scholars admit, however, that not all of the fifteen psalms in this collection are necessarily pilgrimage songs in origin. Sebastian Bullough, for example, has remarked that these songs "may well have been rightfully popular items, brought together with no particular connection among themselves, perhaps used on pilgrimages and so eventually thus labelled"⁽¹⁸⁾. The enigmatic opening words, "I lift up my eyes to the mountains", provide a clue that Ps 121 may not have originally functioned as a pilgrimage song but only took on that role with its incorporation into the "Songs of Ascent". The reference to "the mountains" in this initial clause has prompted a variety of explanations, even within the confines of the psalm's reading as one for pilgrimage. In his commentary, G. Ravasi offers a selection of interpretations of *hehārîm* that ranges from "the mountain chains which the pilgrim must face in difficult ascents" to "the mountains consecrated to idolatry, the habitations of the pagan divinities"⁽¹⁹⁾. Ravasi himself opts to read *hehārîm* "the mountains" as a plural of majesty designating "the mountain" *par excellence*, i.e. Mount Sion⁽²⁰⁾. One key element has generally been overlooked, however. That element is the military and strategic importance of "mountains" in Israel's early history. In the days of the tribal confederation, the central hill country's rugged cliffs and gorges provided ideal terrain for the defensive guerrilla-type warfare Israel would

(Revised and Expanded Edition; Philadelphia 1983) 167. For a recent treatment of "dance" in the Old Testament, see M. I. GRUBER, "Ten Dance-Derived Expressions in the Hebrew Bible", *Bib* 62 (1981) 328-347.

⁽¹⁸⁾ "The Psalms", *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (ed. R. C. FULLER) (London 1969) 489. See also W. O. E. OESTERLEY, *The Psalms. Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes* (New York 1939) 500; KRAUS, *Psalmen* I, 18; G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi: Commento e attualizzazione* I (1-50) (Lettura pastorale della Bibbia 12; Bologna 1981) 61; id., *Il libro dei salmi* III, 506-507.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Il libro dei salmi* III, 527.

⁽²⁰⁾ Ibid., 528.

have engaged in⁽²¹⁾. Even later in Israel's history during the period of the monarchy, Israel's superiority in hill-country conflict continued to be recognized. In 1 Kgs 20,23, for example, the servants of the king of Aram blame their defeat by Israel on the fact that the battle had taken place in the hill country where the Israelites knew how to take advantage of the terrain and had long experience of battle in such contexts. The acknowledgement of this by the Arameans provides a direct verbal and conceptual link with the *hehārîm* of Ps 121,1: "Their god is a god of the mountains ('*elôhê hārîm 'elôhêhem*), and so they defeated us. But if we engage them on level ground, we shall surely defeat them"⁽²²⁾. Once one recognizes the military and strategic sense of *hehārîm* "the mountains" in v. 1, the rest of the psalm's language and imagery falls easily into place and its possible earlier history as a "Prayer of a Warrior" becomes clear. It was among the cliffs and gorges of these "mountains" (*hehārîm*, v. 1) that Yahweh provided the concealing "shade, shadow" (*šêl*, v. 5)⁽²³⁾ that offered "rescue, deliverance" ('*ezer*, vv. 1, 2)⁽²⁴⁾. It was

(21) N. K. GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 B.C.E.* (Maryknoll 1979) 395-396, notes: "It was always possible for groups resisting domination by highland city-state elites to withdraw into relatively inaccessible areas and to escape direct control. It was just such hilly regions that served as base areas for Amarna '*apiru* and for later Israelites". Gottwald cites M. B. ROWTON's article, "The Topological Factor in the *Hapiru* Problem", *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965* (eds. H. G. GUTERBOCK and T. JACOBSEN) (Assyriological Studies 16; Chicago 1965) 376, 382.

(22) See also v. 28: "Thus says Yahweh, 'Because the Arameans have said, "Yahweh is a god of the mountains ('*elôhê hārîm yhw*), and not a god of the valleys", therefore I will deliver all this great multitude into your power, and you shall know that I am Yahweh'". Note as well the ancient title of Israel's God, '*el šadday* "the One of the Mountain"; cf. *IDB* II, 412.

(23) Judg 9,36, for example, notes that "the shadow of the mountains" (*šêl hehārîm*) provided camouflage for Abimelech and his men in their attack on Shechem.

(24) On this meaning for '*ezer*, see B. BAISAS, "Ugaritic '*DR* and Hebrew '*ZR* I", *UF* 5 (1973) 41-52; CERESKO, *Job 29-31*, 142-144. There could also be here a play on the homonymous Hebrew root '*zr* II related to Ugaritic *ğzr* "hero, warrior". For a discussion of the latter see M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms I: 1-50* (AB 16; Garden City 1965) 210; id., *Psalms* III, 157. In his study of Ps 121, T. MAERTENS, *Jérusalem, cité de Dieu* (*Psaumes* 120-128)

among the cliffs and gorges of these mountains (*hehārīm*, v. 1) that Yahweh stood by "at the right hand" ('*al-yad yēmīnekā*, v. 5) of the warrior to "guard" him "from all evil" (*yīšmorkā mikkol-rā'*, v. 7), to accompany him on all his campaigns (*šē'tēkā ūbô'ekā*, v. 8)⁽²⁵⁾, and to prevent his foot from slipping ('*al-yittēn lammôṭ raglekā*, v. 3) as he scaled the heights⁽²⁶⁾. The "shade" (*šēl*, v. 5) which these "mountains" (*hehārīm*, v. 1)⁽²⁷⁾ provide shielded the warrior from the heat of the sun "by day" (v. 6). "By night" (v. 6) that protection and concealment continued as the warrior took his needed rest, for "He does not sleep or slumber, the Sentinel of Israel" (v. 4).

The close relationship between Pss 91 and 121 provides another indication of the latter's earlier role as a "Prayer of a Warrior". Otto Eissfeldt, for example, notes "the unshakable trust in God" to which both psalms give expression and he documents the structural similarities between them⁽²⁸⁾. The two psalms also share a striking

(Collection Lumière et Vie 3; Bruges ²1954) 48-49, also discusses the "military sense" of 'ēzer, e.g. in Isa 31, 1-3; Pss 33,20; 35,1-2.

(²⁵) Simeon de Muis, *Commentarius literalis et historicus in omnes psalmos Davidis* (ed. J. B. BOSSUET) (Louvain 1770) II, 482, remarks on v. 8: "The Lord guards your going out' to war, 'and your coming in', that is, your return home after the war. Usually in the Sacred Scriptures 'going out' and 'coming in' are used concerning (military) expeditions, whence someone returns home, for example Deut 28,6 (*Dominus custodiet exitum tuum ad bellum, et introitum tuum, hoc est, reditum in domum, confecto bello. Proprie in Sacris Litteris exitus et introitus de expeditionibus dicitur, unde quis in urbem redit. Exempli gratia Deut. XXVIII. 6*). Note also Josh 14,11.

(²⁶) Compare Ps 18,37b//2 Sam 22,37b, also in a military context: "and my feet did not slip" (*wēlō' mā'ādū qarsūllāy*).

(²⁷) Or perhaps "the Mountain", i.e. Yahweh; cf. DAHOOD, *Psalms* III, 200; RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 525, 528. GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 796, note 625 (see also p. 684) has seconded the suggestion of Marvin Chaney that the sociopolitical and military significance of the Syro-Palestinian highlands is a key "for understanding the frequent metaphor in early Israel of the deity as 'rock' or 'crag'".

(²⁸) "Psalm 121", 12-13 (= *Kleine Schriften* III, 498-499). Eissfeldt points out, for instance, that both psalms begin with a turning in trust to God (Ps 91,1-2; Ps 121,1-2). Following the first person singular expression of trust, both psalms switch to a third person appeal addressed to the speaker (Ps 91,3-13; Ps 121,2-8). Both conclude with a blessing, the one with a promise by God in the first person (Ps 91,14-16), the other with a similar sentiment expressed in a third person wish (Ps 121,8). On the similarities between Pss 91 and 121, see further H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalmen II: 60-150* (BKAT 15/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn ⁵1978) 1013-1014; J. W. ROGERSON and J.

number of verbal and conceptual parallels. Ps 91's first verse ("who abides in the shade [*bēṣēl*] of Shaddai") finds an echo in Ps 121,5, "Yahweh is your shade (*šillēkā*)". Vv. 5-6 of Ps 91 ("You shall not fear the terror of the night [*lāylā*], nor the arrow that flies by day [*yômām*]") are comparable to Ps 121,6, "By day (*yômām*) the sun shall not strike you, nor the moon by night (*ballāylā*)". The assurance expressed in Ps 91,10, "No evil (*rā'ā*) shall befall you", is repeated in Ps 121,7, "Yahweh will guard you from all evil (*mikkol-rā'*)". Compare also Ps 91,11 ("to guard you [*lišmorkā*] in all your ways") and Ps 121,8 ("He [Yahweh] will guard [*yišmōr*] your going and coming"); Ps 91,12 ("lest you dash your foot [*raglekā*] against a stone") and Ps 121,3 ("He [Yahweh] will not allow your foot [*raglekā*] to slip"). Aubrey Johnson has argued convincingly that Ps 91 is a prayer for the king as he sets out for battle⁽²⁹⁾. The similarities between the two psalms would thus find an explanation in their related function as a prayer in the face of imminent military conflict.

Finally, the interpretation by some of the pre-critical commentators offers support for this hypothesis concerning Ps 121's earlier history. Ignoring the psalm's presence among the "Songs of Ascent", a number of them read the poem's powerful and comforting assurance of the presence and protection of the deity as a most appropriate prayer for one in the midst of struggle and conflict. Simeon de Muis (d. 1654) is explicit about this when he declares, "This entire psalm is a warrior's prayer. And thus I think this psalm is from David or from some other poet, written while on a campaign"⁽³⁰⁾. Further, St. Bernard of Clairvaux quotes Ps 121,3-4 in commenting on Ps 91,11:

W. MCKAY, *Psalms 101-150* (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge 1977) 115; A. F. KIRKPATRICK, *The Book of Psalms* (CBSC; Cambridge 1902) 554.

⁽²⁹⁾ *The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody* (Cardiff 1979) 188. JOHNSON cites as sharing this opinion A. CAQUOT, "Le Psaume ci", *Semitica* 8 (1958) 21-37; M. J. DAHOOD, *Psalms II: 51-100* (AB 17; Garden City 1968) 329; J. H. EATON, *Kingship in the Psalms* (SBT, Second Series 32; London 1976) 57-58.

⁽³⁰⁾ "Tota hujus Psalmi oratio militaris est. Itaque existimo hoc Carmen a Davide, aut aliquo Vate scriptum in castris"; cf. de Muis, *Commentarius*, 480. See also the comment of de Muis on Ps 121,8 quoted above in note 25.

... He does not sleep nor does He slumber, who guards Israel. This indeed is necessary, for neither does he sleep nor slumber who attacks Israel. As the One is anxious for us and cares for us, so the other is anxious to slay and destroy us...⁽³¹⁾.

As well, St. Hilary of Poitiers writes concerning Ps 121,5 ("[he is] at your right hand"):

Thus, because the power of the demons opposing us struggles to weaken and severely wound the best and most efficacious works of our faith, for that reason the vigilant care of God is promised "at your right hand"...⁽³²⁾.

III. From "Prayer of a Warrior" to "Pilgrim Song"

"Pilgrimage" has served as an invigorating and stabilizing factor in human religious activity for millennia⁽³³⁾. This proved no less true for ancient Israel for whom pilgrimage played a central role, to more local shrines in the earlier period and later to the Jerusalem Temple⁽³⁴⁾. In addition to its religious importance, the pilgrimage held enormous social, political, economic, and military significance⁽³⁵⁾. During the period of the Judges, for example, this gather-

⁽³¹⁾ "... non dormit, neque dormitat qui custodit Israel. Id quidem necesse est. Non enim dormit, neque dormitat qui impugnat Israel. Et sicut ipse sollicitus est nostri, et ipsi cura est nobis: sic ille sollicitus est ut nos mactet et perdat..." (Sermo 11, *Qui habitat*; PL 183, col. 225).

⁽³²⁾ "Ergo quia adversantes nobis daemonium virtutes optima et validissima fidei nostrae opera debilitare et convulnerare contendunt, idcirco *super manum dexteræ* custodia dei vigilatura promittitur...", S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis *Tractatus super psalmos* (CSEL 22, 567). Further examples from pre-critical commentators may be found in J. M. NEALE and R. F. LITTLEDALE, *A Commentary on the Psalms: from Primitive and Medieval Writers* 4 (London 1874) 171-177.

⁽³³⁾ See the fascinating chapter on "Pilgrimages as Social Processes" in V. TURNER, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca-London 1974) 166-230.

⁽³⁴⁾ For example, on the place of pilgrimage in Israel's "public religion" of the monarchical period, see M. GREENBERG, "Religion: Stability and Ferment", *The World History of the Jewish People*. Volume 4/2. *The Age of the Monarchies: Culture and Society* (Jerusalem 1979) 79-123.

⁽³⁵⁾ In *The Tribes of Yahweh*, GOTTWALD demonstrates the link between early Israel's social, economic, political organization and its Yahwist religion. He tends to focus on "cult", i.e. the "religious" activities which took place during and at the destination of the pilgrimage, while neglecting the social

ing of the people at regular intervals provided the opportunity for the exchange of news and reaffirmation of family and clan ties⁽³⁶⁾. It also allowed for the request and receipt of economic assistance by a group or groups experiencing crop failures or loss of resources through raids or battles. New local leadership could be introduced and recognized, marriages arranged, internal disputes mediated, and military plans formulated and training undergone⁽³⁷⁾. The new generation was initiated into the life and ethos of the confederation and religious traditions were reinterpreted and accommodated to changing circumstances⁽³⁸⁾. But perhaps most important was the experience, affirmation and celebration of Israel's unity and solidarity as a people and their recommitment to the task of building and creating their common future together⁽³⁹⁾.

During the period of the monarchy and especially with the Deuteronomic reform under Josiah (640-609 BC) the royal shrine in Jerusalem assumed more and more importance as the goal of pilgrimage festivals⁽⁴⁰⁾. A recent study by Mark S. Smith highlights the centrality of pilgrimage to the Jerusalem Temple and how the pilgrimage was "... like visiting paradise and temporarily recapturing the primordial peaceful and abundant relationship with God"⁽⁴¹⁾.

function of the "pilgrimage process" itself; on the latter aspect of pilgrimage see TURNER, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, mentioned above in note 33.

⁽³⁶⁾ Cf. GOTTWALD, *The Tribes of Yahweh*, 282-284, on the importance of the "yearly feast" (*zebah hayyāmim*; e.g., 1 Sam 20,6.28-29) of the *mišpāhā* ("clan" or "protective association of extended families") in early Israel.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. *ibid.*, 242-243, on the function of the *qāhal/ʿedā* ("Congregation"/"Assembly") in early Israel.

⁽³⁸⁾ See GOTTWALD's discussion, *ibid.*, 27-30, of early Israel's cult "as a matrix for tradition formation".

⁽³⁹⁾ On the role of a pilgrimage in "removing the participants from their preoccupation with small-group, convention-ridden, routinized daily life and placing them into another context of existence — the activities and feelings of the larger community", see TURNER, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 168-169 (quoting from C. K. YANG, *Religion in Chinese Society* [Berkeley 1961] 89).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ 2 Kgs 23,1-24. Note the proposal of W. E. CLABURN, "The Fiscal Basis of Josiah's Reform", *JBL* 92 (1973) 11-22, who emphasizes the economic rather than the religious motivations behind the reform.

⁽⁴¹⁾ M. S. SMITH, *Psalms: The Divine Journey* (New York-Mahwah 1987) 45. Smith shows how attention to the importance of pilgrimage and temple illuminates the language and imagery in the psalms. See, for instance, his discussion of the "solar theophany" as an important element in Israel's religious experience reflected in the language about "seeing God" (e.g., Pss 11,7; 17,15; 27,4.13; etc.)

Even if our suggestion above is correct, that Ps 121 had its origin as a "Prayer of a Warrior" (Part II), the incorporation of the poem into the "Songs of Ascent" has precipitated a wholesale re-reading of it in terms of "pilgrimage". The very willingness to take on the journey which the pilgrimage involves concretizes the trust in and devotion of the pilgrim to Yahweh. For Yahweh is the one from whom comes "deliverance" ('ēzer, vv. 1. 2)⁽⁴²⁾. Yahweh is the one who does not let the pilgrim's foot slip along the rough and sometimes dangerous paths to and from the Holy City (v. 3a). At night Yahweh keeps guard as the pilgrim sleeps (vv. 3b-4); Yahweh stands by the pilgrim's side to strengthen, encourage, and protect (v. 5). Yahweh provides "the shade" (šēl) from the harmful rays of sun and moon which beat down on the pilgrims, exposed as they are to all the elements along the way (v. 6).

E. Hanglund has highlighted the importance and pervasiveness of the Exodus and Conquest themes in Israel's hymnic material⁽⁴³⁾. The aspect of "journey" common to both the Exodus-Wilderness-Settlement, i.e. the "journey" from Egypt to Canaan, and the "journey" of the pilgrim to the local shrine or to Jerusalem allows a natural overlapping and interchange between the complex of images associated with each⁽⁴⁴⁾. Indeed, the key word *šmr* "to keep watch, guard", used six times in the psalm, appears in Joshua's recounting of the Exodus/Wilderness journey:

... for it is Yahweh our God who brought us and our ancestors from the land of Egypt ... and guarded us (*wayyišmērenū*) in all the way we went (Josh 24,17)⁽⁴⁵⁾.

and the "light" and "shining" attributed to God's "face" (e.g., Pss 31,17; 80,4.8.20; etc.) (pp. 52-57). SMITH's recent article on Ps 23 ("Setting and Rhetoric in Psalm 23", *JSOT* 41 [1988] 61-66) interprets it as a "psalm of pilgrimage".

⁽⁴²⁾ On this meaning of 'ēzer, see above, note 24.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Historical Motifs in the Psalms* (ConB, OT Series 23; Lund 1984).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Note the remark of MAERTENS, *Jérusalem, cité de Dieu*, 54 on Ps 121,3-4: "Le pèlerinage à Jérusalem prend donc l'allure d'un renouvellement de l'expérience du désert, il devient un petit 'Exode', conduit par le gardien divin, le même qui garde d'ailleurs Jérusalem...". See also CALÈS, *Le Livre des Psaumes* II, 452, on Ps 121,5-6: "Comme autrefois, dans l'Exode au désert, il (Yahweh) servira d'ombrage et d'abri aux pieux voyageurs". Similarly, RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 529-530 (commenting on vv. 5-6).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'Homme*, 421, who also points to Hos 12,14. Note as well Exod 23,20; Jer 31,10 (in describing the "New Exodus", the return from Babylon).

In singing this psalm, the pilgrims on the way to Jerusalem and the "house" of Yahweh would have had little difficulty in imagining themselves as reliving the Exodus experience of their ancestors who also journeyed to God's "house", i.e. the Promised Land⁽⁴⁶⁾. In this context, "the mountains" of v. 1 would suggest *the* Mountain, Horeb "the mountain of God, where, according to Israel's tradition, Yahweh had revealed himself"⁽⁴⁷⁾. The twofold designation of God as "deliverer, liberator" ('ēzer, vv. 1.2) recalls Yahweh's rescue of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. The various assertions specifying Yahweh's protective care in vv. 3-6 fit easily into the situation of Israel in the desert: Yahweh, who does not let the foot "slip" (v. 3a); who "keeps watch" over the sleeping camp (vv. 3b-4); who shelters from the fierce sun and the moon vapors of the desert (v. 5-6)⁽⁴⁸⁾. Yahweh, who "guarded" Israel's "going forth" from Egypt and "entering into" the Promised Land (v. 8, *yīšmor-šē'tēkā ūbō'ekā*)⁽⁴⁹⁾, continues to provide that same providential care for the pilgrims reliving that journey of their ancestors in their pilgrimage to the Holy City.

Finally, whether read simply in terms of pilgrimage in general or pilgrimage as symbolic of the Exodus and Wilderness Wanderings, the psalm in its closing verses becomes a metaphor for the whole of life, all its "goings and comings" (v. 8a) in the midst of which the worshipers have confidence that Yahweh will "deliver" (vv. 1-2) them "from all evil" (v. 7) "from now and unto eternity" (v. 8b)⁽⁵⁰⁾.

(46) On *bēt* "house" as a cipher for the Promised Land, e.g. in Ps 23,6, see FREEDMAN, *Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy*, 300. Note also M. L. BARRÉ and J. S. KSELMAN, "New Exodus, Covenant and Restoration in Psalm 23", *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (eds. C. L. MEYERS and M. O'CONNOR) (Winona Lake 1983) 109-114, 117 (note 20).

(47) J. MORGENSTERN, "Psalm 121", *JBL* 58 (1939) 314. See also MAERTENS, *Jérusalem, cité de Dieu*, 46-48.

(48) On the "Exodus" imagery in vv. 5-6, cf. MAERTENS, *Jérusalem, cité de Dieu*, 56-58.

(49) RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 526, signals the "Exodus" echoes of "going out" and "coming in" here in v. 8.

(50) JACQUET, *Les Psaumes et le cœur de l'Homme*, 422-423, notes that vv. 5-6 focus on the spacial character of God's vigilance and protection, while vv. 7-8 highlight the temporal aspect of that solicitude. He then quotes St. John Chrysostom on v. 8: "Our whole life is made up of comings and goings" (*en toutois gar ho bios hapas, en eisodois kai exodois*; cf. PG 55, 347). On "pilgrimage" in Ps 121 as a metaphor for the whole of life, see

*
* * *

In addition to examining the structure and poetry of Ps 121, the present study has proposed an earlier history of the psalm as a "Prayer of a Warrior". With its incorporation into the new context of the Pilgrimage Collection (Pss 120-134), the poem took on quite a different reading as a Pilgrimage Song. This demonstration of the ambiguity and plurality of the psalm's language and imagery could be paralleled by the ambiguity one might imagine in the psalm's history and use. As a "Prayer of a Warrior" it could be sung by Israelites in a struggle for freedom, for example against Sisera and the king of Hazor (Judg 4-5), or against the Seleucid kings in the time of the Maccabees. The same psalm could also offer comfort and support in the more questionable circumstances of a soldier in one of David's wars of aggression (1 Sam 8). As a Pilgrim Song it could accompany a journey to one of the gatherings of the tribes to reaffirm and celebrate their covenant with Yahweh (e.g., Josh 24; 1 Sam 1). It could also accompany a journey to Jerusalem, to the royal shrine, and represent a submission to royal claims of authority and privilege⁽⁵¹⁾.

The plurality of the psalm's language and imagery and the potential ambiguity in its history and use raise the question of the psalm's "meaning" and of the nature of its claim or claims on an interpreter and his or her community, questions which go beyond

also RAVASI, *Il libro dei salmi* III, 525-526, 530-531. KEET, *A Study of the Psalms of Ascent*, 121, remarks that the Jews recite Ps 121,8 when kissing the hand which has touched the *mëzzüzôt* upon entering or leaving the home.

⁽⁵¹⁾ H. DONNER, "The Separate States of Israel and Judah", chapter VII of *Israelite and Judaeen History* (eds. J. H. HAYES and J. M. MILLER) (OTL; Philadelphia 1977) 387, notes concerning Jeroboam's establishment of the Bethel and Dan sanctuaries (cf. 1 Kgs 12,26-29): "Jeroboam had good reason to be apprehensive about the dangers which might arise from the pilgrimages to Solomon's temple where the ark of Yahweh rested. One could not preclude the possibility that the pilgrims might become consciously or unconsciously, as a result of their visits to Jerusalem, instruments of pro-Davidic propaganda and so undermine the stability of the kingdom of Israel from within". See also C. L. MEYERS, "Jachin and Boaz in Religious and Political Perspective", *CBQ* 45 (1983) 167-178; K. W. WHITELAM, "The Symbols of Power: Aspects of Royal Propaganda in the United Monarchy", *BA* 49 (1986) 166-173.

the immediate scope of this particular study⁽⁵²⁾. But in this demonstration of how the poem was understood and used (or possibly misused) by previous generations, we have given at least some indications of how the "warriors" or "pilgrims" of today may continue to find comfort and encouragement in the psalm's subtlety, complexity; and beauty, and in its unhesitating affirmation of God's ever-watchful care.

Faculty of Theology
University of St. Michael's College
Toronto, Canada M5S 1J4

Anthony R. CERESKO, O.S.F.S.

SOMMAIRE

La première partie de cette étude sur le psaume 121 examine sa structure et sa poésie. Elle traite des différents moyens employés par le poète (p. ex., *inclusio*, *anadiplosis*, *merismus*) et montre comment ils servent à unifier le poème. La deuxième et la troisième parties plaident en faveur d'une histoire antérieure du psaume comme « prière d'un guerrier », et tracent son développement à partir d'une prière de guerrier jusqu'à un hymne de pèlerin, parmi les « cantiques de montée ». La dernière partie discute brièvement quelques implications herméneutiques du pluralisme et de l'ambiguïté dans le langage et dans les images du psaume.

(⁵²) D. TRACY, "Exodus: Theological Reflection", *Exodus — A Lasting Paradigm* (eds. B. VAN IERSEL and A. WEILER) (Concilium 189; Edinburgh 1987) 118-124, explores this "plurality of both language and knowledge and the ambiguities of all histories" (p. 120) in an essay on the Exodus story. In his discussion, Tracy turns the attention from a focus on the text to focus on the interpreter and his or her community and to the social ground or context out of which interpretation takes place. In this regard see also J. L. SEGUNDO, *The Liberation of Theology* (Maryknoll 1983), chapter 1 "The Hermeneutic Circle"; E. SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York 1983); L. CORMIE, "The Hermeneutical Privilege of the Oppressed: Liberation Theologies, Biblical Faith, and Marxist Sociology of Knowledge", *Catholic Theological Society of America, Proceedings* 33 (1978) 155-181; and TRACY's fuller discussion, *Plurality and Ambiguity: Hermeneutics, Religion, Hope* (San Francisco 1987).

ANIMADVERSIONES

Provocation in Luke 4,23-24

"You will surely call my attention to the parable 'Physician, heal yourself' and say, 'Do here in your own land just what you will have done in Capharnaum', but indeed no prophet is accepted in his own land". These words of Jesus, in that they follow upon the reaction of the Nazareans to his synagogue homily, have presented a difficulty to interpreters⁽¹⁾. To be precise, how is it that Jesus is moved to be so critical of his hearers? Is there something in the story-line which would have provoked such a response from Jesus?

The logical place to look for this provocation is in the immediately preceding verse. It should be Luke's report of the reaction of the synagogue crowd that leads logically to Jesus's retort⁽²⁾. Scholars are at odds about this point. Many say that there is nothing in v. 22 which would cause Jesus's reaction in vv. 23-24; for these scholars the Lucan remarks — summed up in the verbs *emartyroun*, *ethaumazon*, *elegon* — are positive in tone and thus show no reason for a critical response from Jesus⁽³⁾. Other scholars, perhaps to make smooth the logic between v. 22 and vv. 23-24, suggest that the contents of the first two Lucan observations — represented by the verbs *emartyroun* and *ethaumazon* — are positive in tone, but that it is the last Lucan report, begun by *elegon* and to be understood after the Marcan parallel story, which suggests a lack of faith which draws the subsequent criticism of Jesus⁽⁴⁾. Finally, still other scholars find that all three verbs are

(¹) For a thorough study of, and an excellent bibliography for, Luke 4,16-30, cf. U. BUSSE, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu* (SBS 91; Stuttgart 1977). An excellent source of still later bibliography is to be found in J.-N. ALETTI, "Jésus à Nazareth (Lc 4,16-30) Prophétie, Écriture et Typologie", *A cause de l'évangile* (Études offertes au P. J. Dupont) (Lectio Divina 73; Paris 1985) 431-451.

(²) Sometimes it is thought that the awkward relationship between v. 22 and vv. 23-24 is due to a poor knitting of sources; for the source-suggestions, cf. J. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; New York 1981) I, 526-527; against the suggestion of sources here, cf. I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter 1978) 97.

(³) E.g., FITZMYER, *Gospel*, 528, 534-535; H. SCHÜRMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT; Freiburg 1969) I, 234, notes: "Jesu Selbstoffenbarung wird auch in Nazareth beifällig aufgenommen"; R. TANNEHILL, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia 1986) I, 70, explains Jesus's unexpected critical response: "Jesus does not confuse wondering admiration with openness to his mission. Jesus abruptly rejects a claim to benefits on the basis of sharing a common 'fatherland' (πατρις)".

(⁴) Cf. E. E. ELLIS, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1974) 97: "The awe inspired by his words was mixed with scepticism because of his origin"; MAR-

capable of a negative connotation, and thus v. 22 becomes a very good logical stepping-stone to the negativity of vv. 23-24⁽⁵⁾.

Given a stand-off in the attempt to understand Jesus's retort as logically subsequent to the report in v. 22⁽⁶⁾, is there any other way of explaining why Jesus would be so suddenly harsh in his dialogue with the Nazareans?

Observations Which Prepare for a Solution

First of all, one cannot overlook the reality of the author's dominance in his story-telling. Usually this dominance is expressed by logic, and in the case of Luke 4, one should expect to find it between vv. 22 and 23-24. But, as occasionally happens, logic between sentences may fail or not come clear; the answer to the problem may then be sought in the consciousness of the author. That is, the author may be preoccupied with a problem; he or she will then have a character introduce this problem, though the comments of the character do not follow completely logically from what has just preceded. What is being recalled here is simply one reality of the author's control and management of his material. It is possible, then (and, in this essay, to be suggested) that this frequent mode of authorial control is at work between Luke 4,22 and 23-24.

A second observation has to do with attention to Jesus's word in v. 23: *erite*. Jesus is here speaking about what the Nazareans *will* say. As a remark about what will happen in the future, it may, but need not, have a visibly adequate foundation in the reaction described in v. 22. What Jesus says in v. 23 is simply a fact Jesus is sure will happen, whatever the preceding reaction of the crowd was to his comments on Isa 61. One might still insist that good story-telling demands that this saying of Jesus in v. 23 be adequately prepared for; but then one might equally insist that here we can employ our first observation that the author is interjecting here a concern the logic of which interjection is to be sought, if not adequately in the sequence of sentences, then in his own mind.

A third observation concerns a look at another element of Jesus's response in v. 23. Jesus says that the crowd will ask that he "do in his own land what he will have done in Capharnaum".

First of all, it is obvious that here the author is imposing himself on the story, for there is no logic to the crowd's knowing at all about the specifics of

SHALL, *Gospel*, 186, also sees this as a possible "alternative" way of interpreting v. 22; SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 235, speaks of "noch etwas Zweideutiges" in v. 22.

(5) Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus's Promise to the Nations* (tr. S. Hooke) (London 1958) 45: "... Luke 4,22 exhibits no break in the attitude of his audience towards Jesus. On the contrary, it records that from the outset unanimous rage was their response to the message of Jesus".

(6) SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 235, sums up the problem: "Der folgende überraschende Umschlag von lobender Zustimmung zur Ablehnung bis zum Lynchversuch wird durch die Perikope nicht psychologisch verständlich gemacht, sondern theologisch: Sie wird durch Jesu Herausforderung bewirkt".

Jesus's future visit to Capharnaum — perhaps the crowd might shrewdly guess he was going there, but it would not know at all what he would do there and therefore not at all expected the crowd to say in its logic that what he did there should first be done in Nazareth.

Secondly, the crowd clearly wants deeds. Now, nowhere in v. 22 are deeds mentioned and the explicit verbs in the Isaiah citation are verbs of "speaking", not of other action; at best one might implicitly see a dim reference to deeds in the statement that Jesus "is son of Joseph", in the sense that, if he "is son of Joseph, he is also one of us, and, being one of us, he will fulfill the Isaian prophecy (which might be generously interpreted to refer to some kind of deeds) and do good deeds for us"(⁷). (Of course, as Jesus suggests, the crowd will not ask that he do what Isaiah had talked about, but that he do what he will have done in Capharnaum!)

The Lucan Preoccupation with the Word of Life

Now, given the above remarks, one begins to look to the preoccupations of Luke for an answer as to why Jesus reacted as he did to his Nazarean neighbors.

One possibility is that Luke wants to comment, early on in his Gospel, about any future requests for signs, without which signs belief in Jesus will not be forthcoming. When the explicit treatment of signs does appear (Luke 12,29-30), Jesus is clear that, if he can be said to give a sign, the sign is simply his preaching, particularly that element of it which looks to repentance. Thus, deeds which should justify faith in him (in specie, the faith of the Nazareans in Jesus) are not in Jesus's program. Perhaps, then, Luke 4,23 is meant to introduce and underline this sharp difference between Jesus and the crowds, whether in Nazareth or in greater Palestine(⁸).

(⁷) Cf. the interpretation of "Is he not the son of Joseph?" by TANNEHILL, *Unity*, 69. In fact I interpret the crowd's question in the same way as Tannehill: it is a way of expressing the crowd's expectation that it deserves special privileges from Jesus, since, "being the son of Joseph", he is one of their own. This question of the crowd seems most important precisely because it is the most specific conclusion drawn by the crowd from what Jesus has said; as such, this question, which is put last in the list of the people's reactions, can in particular be expected to serve as a springboard to what follows next in the story. My contention in this essay is that the crowd's expectation, summed up in its proprietorial question, does not fully justify the retort of Jesus; it is only Jesus's analysis of the crowd found in vv. 23-24 (which expresses the overview of the author) which fully explains his reaction.

(⁸) Jesus's remarks to the Nazareans might suggest that he finds fault with them in that they want signs before they will believe in him. But it is better to conclude that Jesus's criticism lies in this, that the crowd expected the wrong thing from Jesus. They are willing to believe that he is the fulfillment of the Isaiah text, but this fulfillment meant to them that something wonderful would come their way — something Jesus was aware that he was not sent to give them.

Another possibility, the one proposed in this essay and derived from a probable concern of the author, is more complex. To explain it, we must go to the source of Luke 4,31-37, Mark's account of part of Jesus's day in Capharnaum (Mark 1,21-28), an account in which one element was less perfectly integrated into the story and thus visibly in need of Luke's repair.

In the Capharnaum synagogue, Jesus works an astounding miracle: he dismisses with a word the demon which had possessed a man. When all is over, those who witness the miracle are duly astonished, but speak their astonishment in a way which perplexes the reader: *ti estin touto? didachē kainē kat'exousian, kai tois pneumasi tois akathartois epitassei, kai hypakouousin autō*. What is perplexing is not the reference to the command over demons and their obedience, for that is just what has been witnessed, but the inclusion of "new teaching according to authority/power". Why, in short, should a response to a miracle begin with an exclamation about Jesus's new, authoritative/powerful *teaching*?

It seems that Mark has worked out an *inclusio* here. He began his story (in vv. 21-22) by referring to Jesus's teaching, a teaching which astounded everyone (*exēplēssonto*, v. 22), and, unlike that of the scribes, was of one *hōs exousian echōn* (v. 24). The miracle, then, which concludes with the second part of the *inclusio* (*didachē kainē kat'exousian*) becomes important, not only because Jesus shows his authority/power over demons, but because it shows the authority/power of Jesus's new teaching. New *teaching*? It is here that Marcan expression is strained. What he means to say is, not that the miracle is an example of new teaching, but that the miracle is a result of the powerful word of Jesus, a word which is also powerful when expressed in the new teaching of Jesus. In other words, the power/authority of the word which leads to life on the level of miracle is the same power/authority of the word which leads to life on the level of teaching. It is the word that is life-giving, whether through miracle or through teaching.

Such seems to be the logic of the Marcan story (which, however, seems infelicitously expressed). What would have provoked Mark to try to convey this view of the word of Jesus? It is the reader who seems to be most on the mind of Mark. It is the reader who, some thirty years after the marvelous life of Jesus, no longer or rarely experiences the life-giving power of the word in miracles. Indeed, if it be right that Mark wrote to Christians about to undergo persecution in Rome, it is even more crucial that something replace hope in that word which produces life through miracles. This replacement is the word which gives life through teaching. The miracle dealing with demon-possession, then, to which Mark gives primary place in his ordering of Jesus's episodes, is meant to show the power for life that is in the teaching word of Jesus, no matter how many miracles Mark will narrate as characteristic of Jesus. It is the teaching, not the miracle-working, that is the gift to Mark's contemporary Christians now.

If Luke read Mark, he perceived this message, and, though re-writing Mark's conclusion so as to make clearer logical sense, kept the essential Marcan message: *tis ho logos houtos hoti en exousia kai dynamei epitassei tois akathartois pneumasin kai exerchontai*? It is the word of Jesus, in authority and power, which commands and is obeyed.

Is the *inclusio*, originally in Mark, still discernible in Luke? It is, but under a new topical word. Luke begins (4,31) with Jesus's teaching (as in Mark) and remarks how astonished everyone was (*exeplēssonto*, v. 32) at this *didachē autou*. But Luke then adds the reason for this astonishment at Jesus's teaching: *hoti en exousia ên ho logos autou* (v. 32). In this way, Luke has kept dominant the theme of Jesus's teaching, while at the same time making "the word" the *inclusio*-word. Thus, in Luke, it is the word of Jesus which, on the one hand, gives life in miracle, as shown concretely in the miracle of the exorcism, and, on the other hand, gives life through teaching.

Again, one is compelled to ask why Luke would continue this concern of Mark, and one can answer most easily suggesting that Luke was moved by the same concern as Mark — perhaps more so, now that Luke's community is some fifty-five years distant (not to mention geography) from the wonder-working life of Jesus. In short, the same question persists: what remains from Jesus that is life-giving, if not his miraculous word? The answer is: his teaching word is as life-giving as his miraculous word ever was. More tightly put, there is only one *logos*, as there is only one speaker, and from this *logos* comes life, whether through miracle or through teaching.

Application of Luke's Concern about the Word That Saves to the Nazareth Pericope

We return now to our original concern, the sharp rejoinder of Jesus to his fellow Nazareans (Luke 4,23-24). If v. 22 does not justify Jesus's words in vv. 23-24, perhaps it is Luke's concern to emphasize the teaching word of Jesus over against miraculous deeds that justifies Jesus's preoccupation about any future requests for wonder-working. The seeds of this contrast between word and deed are first planted when Jesus identifies himself with the fulfillment of the Isaian text, where an emphasis⁽⁹⁾ lies on the speaking mission of Jesus: *didaskein, euaggelisasthai, kēryxai*⁽¹⁰⁾. The second planting occurs in Jesus's hypothesis that the Nazareans want miracles "like those which will have been done in Capharnaum". Announcing, heralding and miracle-working are here contrasted, because it is to the benefit of Luke's reader to understand the crucial difference between the two, that by and large only the life-giving word in teaching is now available to the Christian, that the life-giving

⁽⁹⁾ It is clear that the other infinitive, *aposteilai*, which expresses a reason in the Isaian citation for which Jesus has been sent, is not of itself a verb of speaking, but a verb of doing. However, its presence does not hinder the emphasis given to the spoken word of Jesus. Moreover, the presence of the verb *aposteilai* can be seen as secondary; primary seem to be the word *aphesi* and the word *tethrausmenous* — it is these two words, one in parallelism with the *aphesin* of Isa 61,1, and the other as synonym of omitted LXX *syntetrimmenous en kardia*, which account for the insertion of Isa 58,6 into Isa 61,1-2a.

⁽¹⁰⁾ TANNEHILL, *Unity*, 78 (cf. also n. 4): "These three terms (*didaskein, euaggelizesthai, kēryssein*) are virtually synonymous. This conclusion is supported by their use in the rest of Luke-Acts".

word in miracle was a reality not to be denied in Jesus's time, but no longer expresses the relationship between Jesus and those who follow him to life.

Luke will not lessen his presentation of the miracles of Jesus; the fact is that for his audience they are no longer a reality in their lives⁽¹¹⁾. On the contrary, he presents more openly than does Mark, concerned with the theology of the sufferings of a miracle-worker, the miraculous works of Jesus. These works reveal much truth about Jesus, show his profound sympathy and help ground the belief that he is nothing short of Messiah and in some way is initiating the Messianic age. But there is another fundamental truth to convey about Jesus, namely that as one does not live by bread alone, so one does not live by miracle alone, but rather by every teaching word, every word of grace which proceeds from the mouth of God and His Messiah.

It is preoccupation, then, with his contemporaries which can explain a jump in logic in the dialogue between Luke's characters. In a real sense, Jesus is speaking as much to Luke's audience as to the Nazareans as he chides over a concern for miraculous deeds. It is the work of the Isaian figure, anointed to preach and announce, to call to repentance, to offer freedom and hope, to teach, that is the perennially powerful work of Jesus — a work of that teaching word which is life-giving. It is response to teaching, to the call to repentance and to the deeds worthy of repentance, that is required, not the searching after life-giving miracles. It is this message which influences at least one aspect of the structure of Luke's programmatic episode.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Rome

John J. KILGALLEN, S.J.

(11) Luke is more than willing to have Jesus identify himself by his miracles; he does this for John the Baptist in Luke 7,19-23. Indeed, within the framework of the Nazareth synagogue episode, references appear readily concerning Jesus's *dynamis* (4,14) and to Jesus's many healings at Capharnaum (particularly 4,40-41). But Luke is still out to establish a correct understanding of the mission and permanent effects of Jesus: he must *euaggelisasthai tēn basileian tou theou* and he was habitually *kēryssōn* (4,43-44).

New Light on Shamgar ben 'Anath

"The playful imagination contains a secret key of the ignorant and unknowing to open the ivory portals of learning..." (Zelda, "The Playful Imagination")

"And after him was Shamgar, son of 'Anath, who smote of the Philistines six hundred men with an oxgoad; and he also saved Israel" (Judg 3,31)*. This summary account of the achievement of Shamgar ben 'Anath represents one of the most puzzling and fascinating episodes in the Book of Judges⁽¹⁾.

The majority of scholars who have investigated the case of Shamgar ben 'Anath are in agreement on at least one point—namely, that Judges 3,31 is a late addition of a fictitious episode inspired by the examples of Samson's battles with the Philistines (cf. esp. Judg 15,15-16) or by the heroic deeds of David's "mighty men" (2 Sam 21,15-22; 23,8-23; esp. 11-12)⁽²⁾. It would seem to us that this commonly held assumption is open to question, and we should like, therefore, to reopen the issue of whether Shamgar was a real person or not—in other words, to determine if we are dealing here with a purely imaginary character or a hero whose existence is rooted in historical reality.

In attempting to throw new light on this question, we shall consider evidence from two distinct sources which have so far not been brought up in this connection: (a) an Egyptian inscription dating from the reign of Rameses IV; (b) archaeological finds relating to Philistine culture that were recently uncovered at sites in the region of northern Palestine.

There have been efforts in the past to interpret the episode of Shamgar ben 'Anath on the basis of Egyptian sources. The most interesting of these

* I am deeply grateful to Prof. Moshe Dothan for calling my attention to recent archaeological finds—some of which have not been published—relating to the problems of Philistine culture. My appreciation goes, as well, to Dr. Janette Balensi for the information she shared with me concerning the discoveries at Tell Abu Hawam.

(1) For a summary of the stylistic, onomastic, geographical and chronological difficulties of this one-verse tale, see, for example, A. VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", *VT* 14 (1964) 294-309.

(2) See, for example, J. L. MCKENZIE, *The World of the Judges* (New York 1966) 125-126; G. F. MOORE, *Judges* (Edinburgh 1966) 104-106; C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges* (New York 1970) 75-77; Y. ZAKOVITCH, "The Associative Arrangement of the Book of Judges", *I.L. Seeligmann Volume* (ed. A. ROFÉ-Y. ZAKOVITCH) (Jerusalem 1983) 179-180 [Hebrew].

is perhaps the attempt to identify Shamgar with a Syrian captain called "son of 'Anath", to whose son Rameses II (1304-1237) gave one of his daughters in marriage as a reward for devoted service⁽³⁾. As has been pointed out, however, the difficulty with this proposal is that the Syrian captain to whom Pharaoh had shown such singular favor lived before the Philistines had begun to menace the coast of Palestine. An effort has also been made to establish an Egyptian etymology for the name Shamgar. Thus one scholar has argued that Shamgar may be a conflation of a transliteration into Hebrew of Egyptian *s'mꜥ*, meaning "wanderer", "stranger", or "beggar"⁽⁴⁾, and the Hebrew word *ger*, which is the translation of the same Egyptian term⁽⁵⁾. Although the derivation is undeniably attractive, if only because of its ingenuity, there is no textual evidence to support it in the Old Testament.

We suggest that at least a partial solution to the problem may be offered in an Egyptian document which has already been published, but has not been cited in connection with Shamgar ben 'Anath. The document in question dates from the third year of the reign of Rameses IV (1166-1160)⁽⁶⁾, and was found incised on the rock surface of Wādy Hammāmāt⁽⁷⁾. The text contains a list of over 8,000 persons who were sent to work at the quarries on this site. Some of these were experienced professional workers such as sculptors and stonecutters; others were inexperienced and unskilled laborers, such as soldiers and temple personnel who had been recruited for the purpose. Mentioned among the latter group are "'prw of the troop of 'An... 800 men" ('prw n nꜥ pꜥ.wt⁽⁸⁾ 'n...s 800). The orthography in the second part

⁽³⁾ See J. GARSTANG, *Judges* (London 1931) 287-288; E. DANIELIUS, "Shamgar ben 'Anath", *JNES* 22 (1963) 191.

⁽⁴⁾ See, *Woerterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*, (Hrsg. A. ERMAN-H. GRAPOW) (Berlin 1971) IV, 470.

⁽⁵⁾ DANIELIUS, "Shamgar", 193.

⁽⁶⁾ The system of "higher chronology" is used here in dating the period of Rameses III and IV; see T. DOTHAN, *The Philistines and their Material Culture* (New Haven-London 1982) 1, note 1.

⁽⁷⁾ J. COUYAT-P. MONTET, "Les inscriptions Hiéroglyphiques et Hiératiques du Ouādi Hammāmāt", *Mémoires IFAO du Caire* 34 (1912) Pl. 4, No. 12 l. 17.

⁽⁸⁾ *pꜥ.t* — the "bow" hieroglyph signifies either a troop or a foreign people; see A. H. GARDINER, *Egyptian Grammar* (London 1966) 511. In the present case, the word *pꜥ.t* appears with the addition of three parallel lines, which signifies a plural, so that it should be read as "troops" or "foreigners". This is in fact the reading of most scholars; see J. H. BREASTED, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago 1906) IV, 226; J. A. WILSON, "The 'Eperu of the Egyptian Inscriptions", *AJSL* 49 (1933) 276; G. POSENER, "Textes égyptiens", *Le problème des Habiru* (ed. J. BOTTÉRO) (4^e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Cahiers de la Société Asiatique XII, Paris 1954) 171; W. HELCK, *Die Beziehungen Aegyptens zu Vorderasien im 3 und 2 Jahr. V. Chr.* (Wiesbaden 1971) 487, ("Truppe"). However, M. GREENBERG, *The Hab/piru* (American Oriental Society; New Haven, Connecticut 1955) 57, translates "bowmen"—which is a possible reading (cf. *Woerterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache*, I, 570, "*pꜥ.t*"), although the adjective for bowman in ancient Egyptian is generally constructed as a nisbe adjective, in other words *pꜥ.ty* (cf. R. O. FAULKNER, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* [Oxford 1967] 97). L. CHRISTOPHE, "La stèle de l'an III de Ramsès IV au Ouādi Hammāmāt", *BIFAO* 48 (1949) 21, 24 proposes that the passage says "'Apru of the tribe of 'Anyth", and speculates that these were prisoners of war who had been put to

of the word beginning with 'n is difficult to make out. Helck, however, proposes that the word should be read as "'Anath" (9). This is a plausible reading in view of the status and character which were attributed to the Canaanite goddess of that name within the Egyptian pantheon during the Ramesside period. This goddess was received into the family of Egyptian deities at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty, at which time her name appears in a variety of Egyptian texts, the most important of which are royal inscriptions. In these latter, 'Anath is revealed to have been primarily a goddess of war and to have been associated in particular with Pharaoh, in her capacity as the sovereign's personal protectress. So, for example, Seti I's pair of stallions, Rameses II's sword, and even one of the latter's daughters were all named after the goddess, in token of her status as the king's personal deity. And concerning Rameses III we are told that "'Anath and 'Astarte are his shield". We also have an ostrakon from the period of Rameses IV in which 'Anath is mentioned as the goddess of the monarch; and at Rameses II's mortuary temple in Tanis, she was worshiped together with the god-king (10).

In the light of these circumstances it is not at all unreasonable that a troop of 'Apiru fighting men in the service of the king of Egypt, perhaps even as part of the corps of Pharaoh's own military retinue, should have been named after the Canaanite goddess of war (11). The inscription at Wādy Hammāmāt would appear to furnish evidence that the men of such a troop were also employed as laborers in public-works projects in peacetime under Rameses IV (1166-1160) (12); we can assume, as well, that the same troop had taken part in the fighting against the Sea Peoples some years earlier, during the reign of Rameses IV's father, Rameses III (1198-1166) (13). We should

forced labor. This hypothesis is difficult to accept, however, since the available material offers no evidence that would even suggest the existence of a unifying tribal consciousness among the Habiru.

(9) HELCK, *Die Beziehungen*, 487. On the other hand, BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, IV, 226, takes the view that 'n stands for the place name 'Ayan, a region of stone quarries east of the Nile, in the vicinity of Cairo. WILSON, "The 'Eperu", 276, is also of this opinion. But Breasted's reading is unpersuasive for two reasons: first, the 'Apiru of the inscription at Wādy Hammāmāt are included among the unskilled workers at the quarry; second, it was customary for soldiers to be named for the goddess 'Anath, a practice to which we shall have occasion to refer further on in this paper.

(10) See HELCK, *Die Beziehungen*, 445, 460-463; also J. LECLANT, "Anat", *Lexikon der Aegyptologie* (Hrsg. W. HELCK) (Wiesbaden 1975) 254.

(11) Egyptian military units were ordinarily named after deities, on the pattern of "troop of Amon" and "troop of Ptah". In this particular instance, however, the name of 'Anath need not have an Egyptian connection or suggest that the troop of 'Apiru was of Egyptian origin, since the goddess was also worshiped by neighboring peoples (see below).

(12) On the Egyptian practice of using soldiers as a labor force in peacetime, see R. O. FAULKNER, "Egyptian Military Organization", *JEA* 39 (1953) 43.

(13) Although a considerable span of some twenty-seven years had elapsed between Rameses III's war with the Sea Peoples (ca. 1190) and the mention of the troop in the inscription from the third year of the reign of Rameses IV, it can be assumed that this was a troop of mercenaries in which the vocation of

therefore do well at this juncture to review what we know about Rameses III's war against the Philistines, and to consider the relationship between this conflict and Shamgar ben 'Anath's battle against the same people.

The Egyptian struggle against the Sea Peoples already began in the reign of Merenptah (1236-1223)⁽¹⁴⁾. However the Philistines emerged as a distinct group among the Sea Peoples in the time of Rameses III⁽¹⁵⁾. This king vanquished the Sea Peoples during the eighth year of his reign, an event which was represented in reliefs and recorded in an inscription in the Temple of Rameses III at Medinet Habu⁽¹⁶⁾. The fighting took place both at sea and on land; and although there is no record of the precise location of the land battle, we have good reason to suppose that it was fought somewhere on the Coastal Plain in the region of Palestine-Phoenicia⁽¹⁷⁾. This hypothesis is supported by two items of information contained in the inscription at Medinet Habu—namely:

a) We are told that the Sea Peoples first defeated Hatti, Kode, Carchemish, Arzawa, and Alashiya; and that they subsequently set up camp in Amor (*Ijmr*), which they had also destroyed⁽¹⁸⁾.

soldiering was passed on by inheritance from father to son (see J. T. MILIK, "An Unpublished Arrow Head with Phoenician Inscription of the 11th-10th Century B.C.", *BASOR* 143 [1956] 6). Thus if there had been a soldier named Shamgar who had taken part in the fighting against the Sea Peoples under Rameses III, either he or his son would have continued serving in a troop that was recalled to Egypt when Rameses IV had acceded to the throne. Egyptian sources tell of soldiers who had faithfully served the king and enjoyed a long life, and were rewarded by the praise and favor of their royal patron.

⁽¹⁴⁾ For references in the Egyptian sources to the Sea Peoples prior to the period of Rameses III, see A. H. GARDINER, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* (Oxford 1947) I, 194-204.

⁽¹⁵⁾ In the Old Testament, however, the term "*p'lyštyim*" does not refer to a particular group among the Sea Peoples, but is used to designate the Sea Peoples as a whole; cf. Y. AHARONI, "Jael the Wife of Heber the Kenite and Shamgar Ben Anath", *Proceedings of the 24th National Conference on Palestinian Geography* (Jerusalem 1968) 60 [Hebrew].

⁽¹⁶⁾ The inscriptions and reliefs relating to Rameses' campaigns against the Sea Peoples are given by BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, IV; W. F. EDGERTON – J. A. WILSON, *Historical Records of Ramses III, The Texts in Medinet Habu* (Chicago 1936) I, II; and, recently, W. HELCK, "Nochmals zu Ramses III Seevoelkerbericht", *Studien zur Altaegyptischen Kultur* 14 (1987) 129-145.

⁽¹⁷⁾ We find it difficult to accept the view of R. STADELMAN, "Seevoelker", *Lexikon der Aegyptologie* (Wiesbaden 1984) V, 814-822 — and after him, N. K. SANDARS, *The Sea People* (London 1978) — that the two battles, one at sea and the other on land, under Rameses III were both fought in the vicinity of the Egyptian frontier proper, near the Pelusian branch of the Nile. Stadelman relies in this on the reliefs of the temple at Medinet Habu, in which the two battles are depicted side by side, with only a representation of a lion hunt separating them. However, examples of other, comparable representations show that the Egyptians were not at all strict in maintaining continuities of content and subject-matter in their depictions (cf., for example, the pictorial representations at the Temple of Karnak). For a refutation on the basis of archaeological evidence, see I. SINGER, "The Beginning of Philistine Settlement in Canaan and the Northern Boundary of Philistia", *Tel Aviv* 12 (1985) 109, note 1.

⁽¹⁸⁾ EDGERTON-WILSON, *Historical Records*, Pl. 46, l. 16-17.

b) The king's preparations for war are described in the following words: "I organized my frontier in *D̄hy*, prepared before them" (19).

On the evidence of the inscription, therefore, the Sea Peoples were based in the land of Amor, in the north of Lebanon, whence they launched their attacks against Egypt; and the king of Egypt made ready to meet the threat by strengthening the frontier of his domain in *D̄hy*—in other words, in the region of Palestine-Phoenicia (20). We can thus assume that the Egyptian army engaged the Philistines as the latter were making their way southward in the direction of Egypt, along the northern coast of Palestine. Further support for this view is furnished in the Old Testament and by recent archaeological finds in the region of northern Palestine.

We read in the song of Deborah: "in the days of Shamgar son of 'Anath, in the days of Jael, caravans ceased, and they that went along the ways used to walk by crooked paths" (Judg 5,6). Shamgar's name is linked in the verse with that of Jael, whose seat was at Kadesh, in the land of Naphtali (Judg 4,11; cf. Josh 19,33). Clearly, then, according to the biblical text, the battle of Shamgar with the Philistines must have taken place in the north of the country (21), regardless of whether the "caravans" (*'ōrâhôt*) and "ways" (*n̄tibôt*) of which the verse speaks are an allusion to an attempt of the Philistines to seize control of one of the branches of the Sea Road, which dominated the international trade routes of the time (22).

The archaeological evidence, too, tends to confirm that the Sea Peoples had already reached northern Palestine in the twelfth century BC. T. Dothan maintains that Myc III c:1b pottery furnishes the earliest indication of the settlement of Sea Peoples in the region (23). This type of pottery made its appearance with the destruction of Canaanite cities toward the end of the Late Bronze period (i.e., approximately the twelfth century), and examples of the type have been found at various sites in the country, including the area along the northern coast and its vicinity—at Tel Abu Hawam, Tel Acco, and Tel Keisan (24). Among the most important material remains pointing to the

(19) Ibid., I. 19.

(20) The question of the geographical situation of Amor and *D̄ahy*, as revealed in Egyptian sources of the New Kingdom, is dealt with by GARDINER, *Onomastica* I, 136, 141, 145, 182; and Y. AHARONI, *The Land of Israel in Biblical Times: A Historical Geography* (Jerusalem 1962) 18, 20, 132, 158 (Hebrew).

(21) Other researchers, too, have suggested that Shamgar ben 'Anath battled the Philistines in the region of northern Palestine, although they do so without considering the Egyptian document and archaeological material which are cited in this paper; see, for example, VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 304-305; A. MALAMAT, "The Days of the Judges", *The History of Israel* (ed. B. MAZAR) (Jerusalem 1968) 222; J. D. MARTIN, *The Book of Judges* (Cambridge 1975) 52.

(22) See VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 303.

(23) T. DOTHAN, "Some Aspects of the Appearance of the Sea Peoples and Philistines in Canaan", *Griechenland, die Aegaeis und die Levante während der 'Dark Ages' von 12 bis zum 9 JH. v. CHR.* (ed. S. D. YALKOTZKY) (Wien 1983) 105.

(24) See DOTHAN, *ibid.*, 100-104; *id.*, *The Philistines*, 69, 82, 84, 90, 290-291. For Tel Keisan, see J. BALENSI, "Tell Keisan", *RB* 88 (1981) 399-401; for Tel Abu Hawam, J. BALENSI, "Revising Tell Abu Hawam", *BASOR* 257 (1985) 65-74; Tel Acco, M. DOTHAN, "Akko 1980", *IEJ* 31 (1981) 110-112; *id.*, "Ten Sea-

existence of Philistine culture in the region at this time is a stone altar uncovered at Acco which has been dated by M. Artzy as belonging to the second half of the thirteenth or beginning of the twelfth century. The altar shows an engraved representation of seagoing vessels that Artzy identifies as being boats of the type used by the Sea Peoples (the Tjekker or Sherden)⁽²⁵⁾. Of equal importance in this connection is A. Raban's undersea excavation of the port at Dor dating from the end of the thirteenth century BC. According to Raban, the distinctive character of the structures and facilities at the site indicate that Sea Peoples were responsible for the port's construction⁽²⁶⁾.

Thus the presence of Myc III c:1b pottery in northern Palestine together with the altar at Acco and port at Dor attest to Philistine habitation on the northern coast of the country, and adds tangible evidence to the data furnished in both the Egyptian sources and the Old Testament account of Shamgar ben 'Anath.

Another find which is of considerable significance to our concern is a bronze arrowhead, dating from the eleventh or tenth century BC, which was discovered in the Beqaa, in Lebanon. It bears an incised inscription which Milik has construed as reading "hs zkr / bn bn-'n", and Yeivin reconstructs as "hs zkrb('l) / bn bn-'n(t)". Both scholars are in agreement, however, that we are dealing here with an instance of a theophoric name connected with the goddess 'Anath⁽²⁷⁾. Milik points out that names in which "'Anath" is a

sons of Excavations at Ancient Acco", *Qadmoniot* 18 (1985) 2-14 [Hebrew]; id., "Sardina at Akko?", *Studies in Sardinian Archaeology* (ed. M. S. BALMOUTH) (Ann Arbor 1986) 105-115. The tentative attribution made by M. Dothan (1986) of the monochrome pottery found at Acco to the Sea Peoples would tend to support our view that Shamgar's battle with the Philistines took place in the north of the country, since the term *p'lyštym*, as we observed in note 15 above, was applied in the Hebrew Bible to the Sea Peoples in general. This view is additionally reinforced by the hypothesis of B. MAZAR, "The Philistines and their Wars with Israel", *The History of Israel* (ed. B. MAZAR) (Masada-Jerusalem 1968) 237 [Hebrew] that Tel Abu Hawam was laid waste following the Philistine invasion in the time of Rameses III; similarly, HELCK, *Die Beziehungen*, 142.

⁽²⁵⁾ M. ARTZY, "Unusual Late Bronze Ship Graffiti from Tel Akko", *Mariners Mirror* 70 (1984) 59-64; id., "On Boats and Sea Peoples", *BASOR* 266 (1987) 75-84. Artzy's identification of the vessels depicted on the altar at Acco as boats of the Sherden or Tjekker does not contradict our claim that it was the Philistines in this part of the country with whom Shamgar did battle. See our comment in the preceding note in regard to Dothan's opinion.

⁽²⁶⁾ A. RABAN, "The Port of the Sea Peoples at Dor", *Qadmoniot* 20 (1988) 81-86 (Hebrew); id., "The Constructive Maritime Role of the Sea Peoples in the Levant", *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Social Structure of the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Half of the II Millennium B.C.E.* (Analecta Orientalia Lovaniensia; Haifa 1985) 261-294 (forthcoming).

⁽²⁷⁾ See MILIK, "An Unpublished", 3-6 and S. YEIVIN, "Note sur une pointe de flèche inscrite provenant de la Beqaa (Liban)", *RB* 55 (1958) 585-589; cf. also the inscription "hs 'bd lb't" incised on javelin-heads discovered in the vicinity of Bethlehem dating from the twelfth and eleventh centuries. J. T. MILIK-F. M. CROSS, "Inscribed Javelin-Heads from the Period of the Judges: A Recent Dis-

component element have been found in Ugarit, as well as in Hurrian, Egyptian, and Akkadian sources dating from the fourteenth through the tenth centuries BC⁽²⁸⁾. He notes, moreover, that the practice of incising names on arrowheads and javelin heads is attested to in examples found in the region of Syria-Palestine, and these would indicate the presence in the area of mercenary armies at the end of the Late Bronze and the beginning of the Iron Age.

In any event, the example of the bronze arrowhead from the Beqaa lends credence to the view that the figure of Shamgar ben 'Anath is more than merely the fruit of the imagination of a biblical weaver of tales, and should rather be regarded as having a real basis in the historical setting of the beginning of the Iron Age. Accordingly, Shamgar would have been a "man of valour" who bore the military "cognomen" of ben 'Anath, a name that was widely used among soldiers in his day. He may have been an archer, like his namesake in the Beqaa—although the biblical text describes him as having done battle with an implement of domestic manufacture, the oxgoad⁽²⁹⁾, a circumstance that would appear to militate against such a conclusion⁽³⁰⁾. If Shamgar was one of the 'Apiru/Habiru, among whom there were a variety of ethnic elements he may have been a Hurrian⁽³¹⁾ or possibly an Akkadian or Canaanite⁽³²⁾; and it is even possible that his name has an Egyptian etymology. Whatever the case, the appellation "ben 'Anath", which appears to have been widespread among men who followed the profession of arms in

covery in Palestine", *BASOR* 134 (1954) 5-15 consider that this inscription, too, refers to the goddess 'Anath.

⁽²⁸⁾ See also F. GROENDAHL, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Rom 1967) 111, 378; P. C. CRAIGIE, "A Reconsideration of Shamgar Ben 'Anath" (Judg. 3:31, 5:6)", *JBL* 91 (1972) 239-240; H. HALLO-H. TADMOR, "A Lawsuit from Hazor", *IEJ* 27 (1977) 1-11.

⁽²⁹⁾ Shamgar's weapon was apparently an agricultural implement which could, if the occasion demanded, be used to effect as a club or staff in armed combat. It is noteworthy that the staff is one of the weapons of the goddess 'Anath; see A. S. KAPELRUD, *The Violent Goddess Anat in Ras Shamra Texts* (Oslo 1969) 48. For an interpretation of the term *malmad habâqâr* as signifying an oxgoad or part of a plow, see Y. YADIN, "*Hadôrbân — Malmad Habâqâr?*", *Tur Sinai Volume* (Publications of the Biblical Exploration Society VIII; Jerusalem 1960) 93-96; and O. MARGALITH, "*Telat Qilôn Wûmalmad Habâqâr*", *Beth Mikra* 106 (1986) 281-286; id., *The Sea Peoples in the Bible* (Tel Aviv 1988) 104 (Hebrew); also VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 306. The claim of O. SCHROEDER, "*Mulmul-lu*", *OL* 10 (1911) 479 that Hebrew *malmâd* is a distortion of Akkadian *mulmul-lu*, and that it has the meaning of "arrowhead", is hard to accept; see VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 306.

⁽³⁰⁾ A claim might be made for Shamgar's being an archer if the Egyptian term *pd.wt*, in the inscription from the period of Rameses IV, is interpreted as signifying "bowmen"; see note 8 above. The fact that the biblical account has him wielding an oxgoad need not invalidate such a view, since this detail in the text can be attributed to the poetic license of the Hebrew author, who intended thereby to add a note of local color to the story of a non-Israelite hero. Accordingly, he armed Shamgar with an oxgoad, which calls to mind Samson belaboring his foes with the jawbone of an ass (Judg 15,15).

⁽³¹⁾ B. MAZAR, "Shamgar Ben 'Anath", *PEF* 19 (1934) 192-194.

⁽³²⁾ VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 299-301.

the ancient Near East in the early twelfth century BC, can be supposed to derive from Shamgar's military calling and to indicate his association with a troop of fighting men which was named after the Canaanite goddess of war. It cannot however be taken as evidence that Shamgar came from the city of 'Anath or 'Anathoth, nor can it be regarded as attesting to a Hanean tribal origin⁽³³⁾.

Assuming that Shamgar was part of an 'Apiru troop of mercenaries in the service of Pharaoh, the fact of his being mentioned in the Book of Judges as an illustrious hero, alongside Jael, should present no special problem. Even if Shamgar's deeds were not done by him for the express purpose of rescuing the Israelites, and had been carried out at the command of a foreign monarch, they nevertheless had the collateral, if unintended, effect of saving the northern tribes of Asher and Naphtali from the menace of Philistine incursions. This, then, would have been the reason that the biblical author or redactor thought it fitting that the accomplishment of Shamgar ben 'Anath should be recorded—albeit briefly and only in the most general terms—in the context of a literary composition made up of the stories of the nation's deliverers.

* * *

Therefore to sum up—Shamgar ben 'Anath was in all likelihood a member of a troop of 'Apiru mercenary soldiers in the employ of Egypt in the time of Rameses III and IV. The appellation "ben 'Anath", which forms part of his name, refers to the Canaanite goddess of war, whose cult had been adopted at the court of the king of Egypt, and is a mark of Shamgar's military calling. He had apparently fought in northern Palestine in the war against the Philistines undertaken by Rameses III with his accession to power (1198-1190). This struggle began prior to the establishment of the Sea

⁽³³⁾ For the suggestion that Shamgar came from the town of Beth 'Anath in the north of the territory of Naphtali, a place which occurs in Egyptian toponymic lists beginning in the period of Thutmose III, see for example W. F. ALBRIGHT, "A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology", *JPOS* 1 (1920) 55-62. See also the attempt of DANIELIUS, "Shamgar Ben 'Anath", 192 to locate the town at a site on the coastal plain, near modern-day Jaffa. All of these conjectures are based on the assumption that the formula "son of X" designates a man's place of origin. For an account of the difficulties presented by such an assumption, see, VAN SELMS, "Judge Shamgar", 301. On the identification of 'Anath with the tribe of the Haneans, mentioned in Mari sources, see F. C. FENSHAM, "Shamgar Ben 'Anath", *JNES* 20 (1961) 197-198 and CRAIGIE, "A Reconsideration", 239-240. This proposal, too, is unconvincing because of the gap in time between the Mari documents and the onset of the incursions of the Sea Peoples.

Peoples in the central Coastal Plain, a region which later came to be known as *Peleşet*⁽³⁴⁾.

Biblical Studies and History of Israel Depts
The University of Haifa
Haifa 31999 Israel

Nili SHUPAK

⁽³⁴⁾ S. YEIVIN, "Qibûš Hâ' âreš", *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Jerusalem 1962) IV, 102 comes to a similar conclusion concerning the chronological setting of Shamgar's struggle with the Philistines. The attempt, however, of R. D. BARNETT, "The Sea Peoples", *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, 366 to date Shamgar's activity in the period of Merenptah (1236-1223) lacks persuasiveness. Although the victory stele dating from the fifth year of Merenptah's reign relates that he had fought against the Sea Peoples, who had come to the assistance of the Libyans, the battle took place on the western frontier of Egypt! A far from convincing case, as well, is made by Aharoni, ("Jael the Wife of Heber") in arguing that Shamgar had fought with Philistines who were in the service of Egypt as garrison troops in Beth-Shean, sometime after the eighth year of Rameses III's reign. The two principal difficulties in the way of accepting Aharoni's view are (a) that Beth-Shean is remote from Kadesh Naphtali, the place of residence of Jael, together with whom Shamgar is mentioned in Judg 5,6; and (b) that after the defeat of the Philistines by Egypt, they were settled by Rameses III in fortresses in Palestine for the specific purpose of defending Egyptian interests (see Papyrus Harris: Pl. 76, 1.6-9). Given these circumstances, had a local hero undertaken an armed conflict with the Philistines he would in effect have directly challenged Egyptian rule in the region. But we find no allusion to an event of this kind in the Book of Judges, wherein Egypt is mentioned only in connection with the Exodus and spoken of in the past tense, and is nowhere referred to as an enemy of Israel contemporaneous with the incidents and persons to which the book is devoted.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Gnilka on Matthew⁽¹⁾

Das Matthäusevangelium 2. Teil completes Joachim Gnilka's commentary on Matthew for Herder's New Testament series. Like the first volume, this too is in every way first-rate and will serve scholars well for years to come. The commentary proper, which covers 14,1-28,20, contains three sections. The first (I) offers analysis of the text (structure, form-criticism, source criticism, major alterations *vis-à-vis* sources). This is followed in the second section (II) by interpretation or exegesis. The final section (III) consists of (a) a summary of the Matthean view of the text, (b) a judgement on its historical worth, and (c) comments on theology and personal application.

Unlike most commentators, Gnilka has saved until the end the so-called introductory matters. The "Einleitungsfragen" are not at the beginning (of vol. 1) but at the end (of vol. 2). Among his major conclusions on these questions are the following:

— Milieu and place: The evangelist lived in a Hellenistic-Jewish milieu, almost certainly in Syria. We should think of Antioch or Damascus.

— Author and time: The author was a Jewish Christian. 13,52 contains his self-portrait. The traditional ascription to Matthew cannot be accepted, but the apostle Matthew was probably known to the community, perhaps as a missionary (cf. 9,9 diff. Mark 2,14). The Gospel was composed c. 80.

— Composition, language, sources: 4,17 and 16,21 are the keys to the structure, which is fourfold: 1,1-4,16 (pre-history); 4,17-16,20 (first main part); 16,21-25,46 (second main part); 26,1-28,20 (passion and Easter). One can say that the author wrote "synagogue Greek", but his style is not as Semitic as the phrase might imply. Mark and Q served as the two main sources, along with oral tradition. The formula quotations were the author's own work.

— *Gattung*: The evangelist wanted to write (although the formulation is modern) a synoptic Gospel, which means: he desired to report on the life

(1) J. GNILKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium 2. Teil* (HTKNT I/2, Freiburg-Basel-Wien) 1988. VIII-552 p. 15,5 × 24,2. DM 118,—.

and works of Jesus. But his special contribution was to narrate the history of the people of God, the way from Israel to the universal church. That is, the First Gospel recounts the history of Jesus Christ as the history of the people of God.

— Matthew's community: Perhaps some members of the school of Matthew were Jewish Christian missionaries from Palestine who brought to Syria the Q tradition. Influence from Essene thought is apparent. Although the Christians no longer attended synagogue, they were close to it, and the synagogue's juridical authority was still a factor for certain Jewish members.

— Theology: The most important christological title is "the Son of God" (the equivalent of "the Son"). There is no difference in content between "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven", and neither can be simply equated with the church. The description of the church as the "new Israel" is appropriate, and the evangelist saw no eschatological salvation for Israel after the flesh. Although the OT law remains in force, it must be judged by the demands of love. Finally, the eschatological consummation, while not immediately near, lies in the foreseeable future.

Most of these conclusions probably represent the consensus of modern scholarship and may be accepted. There are, however, at least three important issues concerning which second thoughts are in order.

1. *Moses*. In the section on "Themen der Theologie" Moses receives only passing mention. It is noted (536) that there is a Moses typology in chapter 2 and that both 5,1 and 8,1 recall Sinai (cf. vol. 1, 34-35, 109-110, 283-284). But then Gnilka immediately goes on to another subject. The impression with which one is left is that the Mosaic motifs constitute a rather distal twig on the tree of Matthean Christology. While widely accepted today, in some measure because of W. D. Davies' lengthy and important examination of the theme⁽²⁾, the position is not tenable.

(a) In 5,1 Jesus goes up on a mountain. As Gnilka fully appreciates, (vol. 1, 109), the phraseology recalls passages from the Pentateuch⁽³⁾, just as the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount (SM) may be compared with Deut 30,15-20. But Jesus also *sits* on the mountain⁽⁴⁾. Although Gnilka does not note this, the circumstance should probably be related to Moses. The Hebrew of Deut 9,9 (a text which may be alluded to in Matt 4,2) can be taken to mean that Moses *sat* on Mount Sinai, and some rabbinic sources contain this interpretation⁽⁵⁾. Given that so much in Matt 5,1-2 so strongly puts Sinai in mind (see Gnilka, vol. 1, 109-10), one suspects that when Jesus sits on the mountain he is being like the lawgiver.

⁽²⁾ W. D. DAVIES, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge 1966) 14-108. (Davies is now willing to give more place to the Mosaic element in Matthew; see his forthcoming article: "The Jewish Sources of Matthew's Messianism".)

⁽³⁾ E.g. Exod 19,3.12.13; 24,12.13.18; 34,1; Num 27,12; Deut 1,24.41.43.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. John 6,3, which is part of the introduction to a chapter filled with parallels between Jesus and Moses.

⁽⁵⁾ b. Meg. 21a; b. Soṭa 49a; PRE 46. Note also the much earlier *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian, lines 67-82. Here too Moses sits on Sinai.

(b) Although this point is minor, the next is not. The Mosaic motifs in Matt 2 and 5,1 and 8,1 should not be considered in isolation from each other or from the surrounding chapters. They are instead part of a typology which runs throughout Matt 1-8. The parallels between Jesus and Moses begin already in Matt 1, where the promise of Israel's saviour is given in a dream (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 2,210-16) and the father's doubt is dispelled by an angelic appearance (cf. *LAB* 9,10). Moreover, a new exodus motif seems plain in chapters 3-4, where Jesus passes through the waters of baptism and then enters into the desert to suffer temptation for forty days⁽⁶⁾. That the parallels with the exodus and desert wanderings of Israel have informed the text is demonstrated by the scriptural quotations in chapter 4, which are drawn from OT texts about Israel's time in the wilderness (4,4 = Deut 8,3; 4,7 = Deut 6,16; 4,10 = Deut 6,13). Clearly an extensive typology informs all of Matt 1-8:

	Moses	Jesus
Unusual circumstances surrounding and confusion concerning wife's pregnancy	Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 2,210-11; <i>LAB</i> 9,1-6	Matt 1,18-19
Prophecy of Israel's saviour	Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 2,212-16; <i>LAB</i> 9,10; <i>Mek.</i> on Exod 15,20; <i>b. Soṭa</i> 12b-13a	1,20-21
King informed of birth of future liberator by scribes or wise men	Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 2,205-209, 234; cf. <i>Tg. Ps.-J.</i> on Exod 1,15	2,1-8
Slaughter of Jewish infants by Gentile king	Exod 1,15-22; Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 2,205-209; <i>LAB</i> 9,1	2,16-18
Infant saviour miraculously delivered	Exod 2,1-10; Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 2,217-23	2,13-15
Exile	Exod 2,15	2,13-15
Return from exile after those seeking hero's life have died	Exod 4,19-20	2,19-23
Passage through the waters/baptism	Exod 14-15	3,13-17
Temptation in the wilderness for forty years/days	Deut 1,1ff.	4,1-11
Ascent of and sitting upon a mountain	Exod 19,3; Deut 9,9; <i>b. Meg.</i> 21a; <i>b. Soṭa</i> 49a	5,1-2

⁽⁶⁾ Paul also drew a parallel between baptism and crossing the Red Sea: 1 Cor 10,1-5. Note Calvin, *Inst.* 4,12,20: "The nature of his [Jesus'] fast is not different from that which Moses observed when he received the law at the hand of the Lord (Exod 24,18; 34,28). For, seeing that that miracle was performed in Moses to establish the law, it behaved not to be omitted in Christ, lest the gospel should seem inferior to the Law". — Gnlika, vol. 1, 84-92, puts the parallels between Jesus' temptation and the exodus events in the background.

	Moses	Jesus
Deliverance of God's demands to the people of God	Exod 20,1-17; etc.	5,3-7,28
Descent from the mountain	Exod 19,14; 32,1, 15; 34,29	8,1

These parallels are much more than decoration. They have largely determined the structure of the first eight chapters of Matthew. Their theological meaning is, as we shall see, considerable.

(c) In 2,15 the evangelist quotes Hos 11,1 ("Out of Egypt have I called my son"). Gnilka, who rightly considers the formula quotation to be the author's own work, affirms that here there is an analogy between the life of Jesus and the experience of Israel (vol. 1, 51). True enough. But what needs to be underlined is that the OT Scripture has to do with the exodus ("Out of Egypt..."). We have here not some general parallel between the history of Jesus and the history of Israel. Rather, the reader is being informed that *the story of Jesus is the story of a new exodus*. The Messiah recapitulates the crucial, formative chapter of Israel's history, which was so dominated by the figure of Moses.

(d) In commenting on 11,18 and its promise of rest (καὶ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς), Gnilka cites Sir 51,23ff. He does not observe that the closest LXX parallel is Exod 33,14: καὶ καταπαύσω σε. This matters so much because that OT text is, just like Matt 11,28, immediately preceded by a passage which is about God knowing an individual and that individual knowing God (Moses affirms that God knows him and then asks that he might know God). See Exod 33,12-13. In the one case we have a prayer of Jesus, in the other a prayer of Moses. And there are other parallels. If Jesus is meek (11,29), Moses was, for Judaism, the exemplar in meekness (Num 12,3; Sir 45,4; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2,279; b. Ned. 38a). And if Jesus has a yoke (11,29), Moses was the one who handed to Israel the yoke of the Torah. A careful examination of Mt 11,25-30 shows that the Mosaic background is crucial for interpretation⁽⁷⁾. Gnilka has entirely missed it.

(e) The mountain of 15,29 is a place of gathering, healing, and feeding. Also, 15,30-31 may well allude to Isa 35,5-6, part of an eschatological prophecy concerning Zion (cf. Origen, *Comm. on Mt.* 11,18). Although Gnilka does not mention the possibility, all this suggests, as T. L. Donaldson has convincingly argued, a Mount Zion typology⁽⁸⁾. In Jewish expectation Zion is the eschatological gathering site of scattered Israel, a place of healing, and the location of the messianic feast⁽⁹⁾. How does all this relate to the fact that elsewhere in Matthew the mountain motif is so clearly linked with Sinai, as well as to Gnilka's comment (37) that 15,29-39 may well allude to Ps

(7) D. C. ALLISON, Jr., "Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11,25-30", *JTS* 39 (1988) 477-485.

(8) T. L. DONALDSON, *Jesus on the Mountain* (JSNTS 8; Sheffield 1985).

(9) Texts in DONALDSON, *Jesus*, 35-49, 51-69.

107,4-5 and the wilderness situation of Moses? The answer is straightforward. Already in the OT Sinai and Zion are closely associated, as in Ps 68, and this is also true in later Jewish tradition (e.g. *Liv. Proph. Jer.* 11-19; *Tg. Neofiti* on Exod 4,27; *Midr Rab* on Ps 68,9). A key text in this regard is Isa 2,2-3: "out of Zion shall go forth Torah". Here Mount Zion functions as the eschatological Sinai, the mountain of the law. In view of this, one should not set the Sinai parallels over against the Zion parallels (Donaldson's tendency). On the contrary: the two go hand in hand. Both make Jesus the eschatological counterpart of Moses.

(f) Gnilka has downplayed the Mosaic motifs in Matthew's account of the transfiguration, 17,1-8. While not denying the influence of Exod 24 and 34 upon Matthew's tradition (= Mark), he does not think that the First Evangelist was much concerned with the Mosaic parallels. This is hard to believe. Why is Moses mentioned before Elijah (contrast Mark)? Why has "and his face shone like the sun" been added to the Markan account? Why has the cloud become "bright" (φωτεινή)? Why has "in whom I am well pleased" been inserted? Why has Mark's ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ become αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε⁽¹⁰⁾? While Gnilka makes various suggestions, he does not observe that all five questions may be given the very same answer: the evangelist wished to send his readers' thoughts back to Moses and the Pentateuch. Thus no priority of significance is given to Elijah. Moses now comes first. "Face" and "sun" recall the extra-biblical tradition that Moses' face (cf. Exod 34,29) shone like the sun (cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 2,70; 2 Cor 3,7-18; *LAB* 12,1; *Sipre Num* 140). φωτεινή alludes to the Shekinah, which accompanied Israel and Moses in the wilderness. The citation of Isa 42,1 ("in whom I am well pleased") makes Jesus the 'ebed YAHWEH and connects him with a text about a law which the coastlands await—while Moses was both lawgiver and servant *par excellence* (Exod 14,31; Num 12,7-8; Josh 1,1; etc.). And the change to αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε strengthens the allusion to LXX Deut 18,15 (αὐτοῦ ἀκούσσεσθε), which speaks of a prophet *like Moses*. Is it credible that our evangelist, steeped as he was in the OT and with an undeniable interest elsewhere in the similarities between Jesus and Moses, would have missed or been uninterested in the clear allusions to Moses in Mark 9,2-8? Is it just coincidence that so many of Matthew's alterations can be related to Mosaic motifs?

(g) In commenting on 28,16-20 Gnilka notes that the promise of God's presence is found in the OT in, among other places, Josh 1,9 (510). He does not remark that there are additional resemblances between Josh 1 and Matthew's concluding pericope. The promise of divine presence is given also in Josh 1,5 and 17. And Joshua is told by God: "Be careful to do according to all the law which Moses my servant commanded you" (Josh 1,7; cf. Matt 28,20, also *T. Mos.* 1,10). Further, the command "to go" (πορεύομαι) is found in both instances (LXX Josh 1,9, 16; Matt 28,19), and ἐντέλλομαι (cf. Matt 28,20) is used again and again in LXX Josh 1 (vv. 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16,

⁽¹⁰⁾ I follow Huck-Greeven (against Nestle-Aland²⁶) in reading αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε in Matt 17,5.

18). Given that the setting of Matt 28,16-20, being a mountain, calls to mind the other Matthean mountains with their Mosaic associations, it is possible that Matthew's ending harks back to Josh 1, which marks the end of Moses' time with his people and the dawn of a new era. Should we think that just as Joshua filled the office of Moses, so too the disciples go into the world to exercise the ministry of Jesus?

(h) On p. 297 of vol. 1, in the commentary on 8,4, Gnilka writes: "Mose wird in unserem Evangelium immer in Verbindung mit dem Gesetz und seinen Vorschriften erwähnt (19,7; 22,24; 23,2; 17,3f)". The assertion is sound, and it can be extended to texts Gnilka does not cite. For example, the Mosaic typology in Matt 1-8 culminates in the Sinai parallels and serves to frame the SM, where Jesus delivers his messianic Torah. 11,25-30, so coloured by Mosaic themes, refers to Jesus' "burden" or "yoke", again some sort of counterpart to the law given through Moses. 17,1-8 recalls Moses' descent from Sinai after the law was given. Lastly, if 28,16-20 does allude to Josh 1, that chapter is filled with references to doing the law Moses spoke. The point is clear. The interest in Moses is in great measure interest in the law, especially in the question: How is the new revelation related to the old? The Mosaic motifs work together to show that the new is like the old (chapters 1-8; 17,1-8) so that, while the new does surpass the old (cf. 5,20-48), there is no real contradiction between the two (cf. 5,17-20). The God of Jesus Christ is the God of Moses.

In addition to the material just reviewed, there are other places where Gnilka has perhaps not done justice to the parallels between Jesus and Moses⁽¹¹⁾. How important is his muting of this theme? The First Evangelist was a Jew who believed that the Messiah had come. He necessarily constructed his theology with Jewish presuppositions, believing above all that the old and the new were the work of one God. It was altogether natural that for him, as for Paul⁽¹²⁾, the eschatological people of God had come to birth in a new exodus. Indeed, it was almost inevitable. For Matthew history *had* to repeat itself, the end *had* to be like the beginning⁽¹³⁾. For him, the last redeemer, Messiah Jesus, *had* to be like the first redeemer, Moses⁽¹⁴⁾. All this was given with his Jewish outlook and his grounding in the Scriptures. Furthermore, such theological convictions were not at the periphery of

⁽¹¹⁾ Possibilities include 9,36 (cf. 2,6; 10,6; 12,30; 15,24; 18,12-13; 25,32; 26,31; in these places Jesus is a shepherd; so was Moses: Exod 3,1; Josephus, *Ant.* 2,263-264; *LAB* 19,3, 9; note also Num 27,17); 14,21 (see W. D. DAVIES and D. C. ALLISON, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 2 [ICC; Edinburgh, forthcoming] *ad loc.*); 21,5 (quoting Zech 9,9; Moses was "meek" [cf. p. 529] and rode an ass [Exod 4,20; *Qoh. Rab.* 1,8]); and 24, 3 (Moses saw the future and heavenly, eschatological secrets on a mountain: *Jub.* 1,1-6; *11QTemple* 51,6-7; *LAB* 19; 2 *Bar.* 4,5; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Deut. 34,1).

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. 1 Cor 10,1-5; 2 Cor 3,1-11.

⁽¹³⁾ Texts and secondary lit. in N. A. DAHL, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis 1976) 120-140. For the hope of a new exodus see W. D. DAVIES, *The Gospel and the Land* (Berkeley 1974) 83-85.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See H. J. SCHOEPS, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949) 87-98.

Matthew's mind. They were instead at the heart of his theology. They moved him to set the SM in a Mosaic framework and to recast such key texts as 11,25-30; 17,1-8; and (perhaps) 28,16-20. Surely they deserve more consideration and discussion than Gnilka and other scholars have given them.

An additional observation. It is a commonplace to affirm that in Matthew Jesus is greater than Moses (cf. Gnilka, vol. 1, 109). Moses was not born of a virgin. He was not the Son of God. He did not die for the sins of the world. These facts and others like them have led scholars to imagine that the differences between Jesus and Moses are far more weighty than the similarities and that therefore these last could not have been central for the redactor. But maybe this inference betrays our distance from Matthew's world. For ancient Jews Moses was a colossus. He was the instrument of the exodus and the mediator of God's special revelation, the Torah. Some first-century Jews evidently thought he could not die but ascended to heaven⁽¹⁵⁾. Philo called him a θεός (*De sac. A.C.* 9; *Mut. nom.* 19). The fact that Moses is, incredibly, named only once in the Passover Haggadah, and only incidentally, must reflect reaction against a perceived inordinate reverence towards or glorification of him. For Matthew's first audience, then, the comparison between Jesus and Moses was almost certainly far-reaching and of powerful impact. What more could have been said of a man than that he was truly like Moses? Given Moses' unrivalled stature, as well as the Early Christian conviction that Jesus was the prophet like Moses (cf. Acts 3,22-23), the parallels between the two figures were not just there for the sake of the differences. We would do well to keep in mind that comparison of other ancient figures with Moses served first to exalt them⁽¹⁶⁾.

2. *Structure.* As already remarked, Gnilka finds the repetition of ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς in 4,17 and 16,21 to mark the main divisions of the Gospel. Unlike J. D. Kingsbury⁽¹⁷⁾, however, he draws a line between 25,46 and 26,1 and so offers the outline given above on p. 526. I shall not rehearse here the arguments for and against this and related schemes which find the two main turning points to be 4,17 and 16,21. Suffice it to say that I remain unpersuaded, in part because I expect more from a structural analysis. It simply does not seem very enlightening to observe that Matthew has a pre-history, a first main part leading up to the first passion prediction, a second main part leading up to the passion narrative proper, and a conclu-

⁽¹⁵⁾ S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "The Death of Moses", *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (ed. G. W. E. NICKELSBURG) (Missoula 1976) 185-217.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For David compare 2 Chr 8,14 with 30,16. For Josiah compare Deut 9,21 with 2 Kgs 23,6 and Deut 34,10 with 2 Kgs 23,25 and note R. E. FRIEDMAN, *Who Wrote the Bible?* (New York 1987) 111-114. For Jeremiah see *Liv. Proph. Jer.* 17-19, for Ezekiel *Liv. Proph. Ezek.* 15, for Ezra 4 Ezra 14 and *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 6,3-26, for Hillel *b. Sukk.* 20a, for Samuel *Tanḥuma*, Naso 16a. See further DAVIES, *Setting*, 108, n. 2, on Akiba. Also worth remembering are the numerous parallels between Moses and Constantine in Eusebius' *De vita Constantini* and between Moses and Theodosius in Socrates Scholasticus' *Historia ecclesiastica*.

⁽¹⁷⁾ J. D. KINGSBURY, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia 1975) 1-39.

sion. This says little more than that Matthew, like most books and stories, has a beginning, a middle and an end. The problem can be seen from this, that the outline is sufficiently bereft of specificity as to fit Mark with equal ease: Prehistory: 1,1-19; 1. Main part: 1,20-8,30; 2. Main part: 8,31-13,37; passion and Easter: 14,1-16,8.

But there is an even more nagging consideration. The outline does not explain why paragraphs are where they are. Why is the story of the plucking of the grain (12,1-8 = Mark 2,23-28) precisely where it is and not, let us say, somewhere in chapter 8 or 9? Why is the missionary discourse (10,5-42; cf. Mark 6,7-13) before the parable discourse (13,1-52; cf. Mark 4,1-34) and not, as in Mark, after it? Why does the discourse in Matt 18 come before instead of after the eschatological discourse in 24-25? Should an outline not help with such questions?

Gnilka observes that "Mt ordnet den Stoff immer wieder nach sachlichen Gesichtspunkten an. Letztlich beruht auf diesem Bemühen die Zusammenstellung seiner Reden" (524). Gnilka is, however, disinclined to place thematic labels on the main discourses and narrative sections. Note that he is content to call 4,17-16,20 "1. Hauptteil" and 16,21-25,46 "2. Hauptteil". Unpersuasive in his judgement are all attempts "Teilabschnitte unter wirklich treffende, das heisst, die Absichten des E wiedergebende Themen zu stellen. Die Themenvorschläge machen fast immer den Eindruck des Subjektiven" (523). But perhaps there is a way to circumvent the seemingly inevitable subjectivity.

If one looks at the various outlines of Matthew offered by different scholars, maybe most take into account the striking alternation between narrative (N) and discourse (D):

1-4	5-7	8-9	10	11-12	13	14-17	18	19-23	24-25	26-28
N	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	D	N

That this regular alternation was important for the evangelist is all but proven by the fivefold repetition of the stereotyped formula after the five discourses, see 7,28; 11,1; 13,53; 19,1; 26,1. It is also confirmed by this, that the openings of the discourses also share much in common⁽¹⁸⁾. So much scholars have, since Bacon, seen. But Bacon's influence has been as much bane as blessing. In his failed attempt to divide Matthew into five "books" and so find a parallel to the Mosaic Pentateuch, he married each discourse to a narrative. His first "book", for instance, consisted of 3,1-4,25 (N) + 5,1-7,27 (D), his fifth "book" of 19,2-22,46 (N) + 23,1-25,46 (D). The important point is this. Even when rejecting the details of Bacon's scheme,

⁽¹⁸⁾ T. J. KEEGAN, "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses", *CBQ* 44 (1982) 415-430.

scholars have often (i) continued to bind together narratives and discourses and (ii) attempted to discern some common theme⁽¹⁹⁾. But what is the justification for this procedure? What happens when instead one simply considers each narrative section and each discourse on its own terms? I should like to suggest that the result produces both the structure and the plot of the First Gospel. Consider the following outline⁽²⁰⁾:

- 1-4 N Introduction (pre-history)
- 5-7 D Jesus' words (the demand to Israel; the SM)
- 8-9 N Jesus' compassionate and mighty deeds
- 10 D Words and deeds of the disciples (the missionary discourse)
- 11-12 N Israel's rejection of Jesus and his disciples
- 13 D Understanding the rejection (the parable discourse)
- 14-17 N Jesus founds his church (16,13-20 is the key text)
- 18 D Words to the church (the ecclesiastical discourse)
- 19-23 N Journey to Jerusalem and prologue to the passion
- 24-25 D The future of the church (the eschatological discourse)
- 26-28 N Conclusion (passion and resurrection).

A few comments are in order. Chapters 1-4, which contain the infancy stories, the material on John the Baptist, the temptation, the coming to Galilee, and the calling of four disciples, function to introduce Jesus. They are, in Gnlika's words, a "pre-history" (although he draws the line at 4,16). They set the scene for all that follows.

The first major discourse is the SM with its three major sections: the law (5,17-48), the cult (6,1-18), and social issues (6,19-7,12)⁽²¹⁾. It contains Jesus' demand for the people of God.

If the SM gives us Jesus' words, Matt 8-9 shows us his ministry in Israel. It is largely a record of Jesus' acts, particularly his compassionate miracles. Jesus also speaks in this section, but the emphasis is upon his deeds (cf. the summary in 8,16-17). Gnlika's term, "Wunderzyklus", is apt.

Having been informed of what Jesus said (Matt 5-7) and what he did (Matt 8-9), we next are told, in chapter 10, the second discourse, what Jesus commanded his disciples to say and do. The theme of imitation is crucial (cf. Gnlika, vol. 1, 360, 379-380). The disciples should proclaim what Jesus proclaimed (cf. 10,7 with 4,17) and should do what Jesus did (cf. 10,8 with chapters 8-9 and 11,2-6). The disciple is like his teacher, the servant like his master (10,24-25). For Matthew Jesus is really the first Christian missionary, and his disciples must follow in his footsteps.

The chapters on the words and deeds of Jesus and the words and deeds of the disciples are followed by chapters 11-12. These recount primarily the

⁽¹⁹⁾ E.g. D. HILL, *The Gospel of Matthew* (New Century Bible; London 1972) 44-48.

⁽²⁰⁾ For related approaches see J. C. FENTON, *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (rev. ed.; London 1977) 14-15 and D. BARR, "The Drama of Matthew's Gospel", *Theology Digest* 24 (1976) 349-359.

⁽²¹⁾ Gnlika (vol. 1, 112) similarly divides the SM into three major sections.

response of "this generation" to the eschatological messenger(s) God has sent to Israel, its reaction to τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (11,2). This is what the material on the Baptist is all about, as well as the woes on Galilee and the conflict stories in chapter 12. It all adds up to an indictment of corporate Israel: she has rejected the Messiah. But the focus on rejection is punctuated by the invitations and hope found in 11,25-30; 12,15-21; and 12,46-50 (cf. Gnilka, vol. 1, 470, on 11,25-30 and 12,46-50: "positiven Ausblick").

Because the rejection of the Messiah by Israel is so foreign to Jewish eschatological expectation, chapters 11-12 are followed by 13, which functions firstly as a sort of theodicy, explaining how there can be different responses to the one message (13,1-23), how the devil works in human hearts (13,24-30), and how all will be made right in the end (13,31-33.36-43.47-50). Gnilka, vol. 1, 475, rightly comments that the chapter must be read "im Zusammenhang mit dem Unglauben Israels".

The narrative material in Matt 14-17 is less easy to characterize than that in 1-4 or 8-9 or 11-12. Here one sympathizes with Gnilka's reluctance to discern larger thematic sections. But granted the truth of Markan priority and the existence of Q, Matthew has, by the time he gets to 14,1, used up most of Q. What he has left he wishes for the most part to save for 18 and 24-25. So, beginning with 14,1, it is not so easy to be creative. This is why there is a change in procedure, why in the subsequent narrative sections Matthew now follows Mark with little deviation (cf. Gnilka, 521). Nonetheless, this does not eliminate a thematic approach to 14-17. There can be no doubt that the most memorable pericope in 14-17 is 16,13-20, where Jesus founds his church⁽²²⁾. It fits so well the larger literary context because after Israel has forfeited her role in salvation-history, God must raise up a new people. That this is in fact the dominant or most important theme of the section is hinted at by two considerations. First, Peter is the rock upon which the church is built, and it is precisely in this section that he comes to the fore; see 14,28-33; 15,15; 16,13-20; 17,24-27 (all insertions into Mark). His emerging pre-eminence correlates with the emergence of the church. Secondly, Matt 14-17 contains the two feeding stories (14,13-21; 15,32-39) and these, *pace* Gnilka, probably point to the Eucharist, a uniquely Christian sacrament. The narrative, then, is moving from Israel to the church.

All this is confirmed by Matt 18, the next major discourse. "Von ihrem Inhalt her geht sie gewiss in besonderer Weise das Gemeindeleben an" (Gnilka, 119). This makes sense. After founding the church, Jesus next delivers her special instruction.

Having established the church and given her teaching, it remains for Jesus to go to Jerusalem. This is the subject of the next narrative section, 19-23. The material is mostly from Mark, with the woes of 23 added⁽²³⁾.

⁽²²⁾ J. P. MEIER, *Matthew* (Wilmington 1980) gives to Matt 14-17 this title: "The Itinerant Jesus Prepares for the Church by His Deeds".

⁽²³⁾ Gnilka wrongly counts Matt 23 as a sixth discourse. But see KEEGAN, "Introductory Formulae" (cf. n. 18).

Before the passion narrative proper, Jesus, in Matt 24–25, speaks about the future, that is, the future of the church. Adopting Mark's "little apocalypse", and adding to it Q and M material, Matthew has Jesus take the reader beyond Matt 26–28. That the discourse comes last makes perfect sense. Eschatology always belongs at the end. This is why each of Matthew's major discourses closes with teaching on eschatology, why Revelation concludes the NT, why 9,15 is the last chapter of m. Soṭa, and why the final chapter of most systematic theologies concerns the last things.

Following chronological order, Matthew brings his book to a close as does Mark (and the other canonical Gospels for that matter). The passion and resurrection constitute the conclusion (cf. Gnilya's analysis).

The virtue of the proposed outline, which intimately relates structure to plot, is that it is not artificially imposed but falls out naturally from the alternation of narrative and discourse. No less significantly, the outline reveals why everything is where it is. To return to the questions asked on p. 533, the controversy story in Mark 2,23–28 is saved for Matt 11–12 because there the issue is Israel's rejection of Jesus. The missionary discourse comes before and not after the parable chapter because overture and rejection must precede explanation. And chapter 18, with its directives for community relations, comes where it does because it must follow the founding of the church.

3. *Israel*. On p. 545 Gnilya affirms that our Gospel nowhere suggests that Israel will in the end repent and find eschatological salvation. The kingdom has been taken from her and given to the church (21,43). The church is the new Israel. For the old Israel all is lost.

One has doubts. The Dead Sea Scrolls, *Jubilees*, the Pauline epistles, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in their present (Christian) form, and even Justin Martyr all show that it was possible to condemn contemporary Israel and still hold out hope for her redemption. Given that the same is true of certain OT prophets in their canonical form (e.g. Hosea and Amos), and given that the expectation of an end-time repentance for Israel was widespread in Jewish circles, it is not possible to make easy inferences from such harsh texts as Matt 8,11–12 and 27,25. Moreover, 10,23 presupposes a mission to Israel up to the end (cf. Gnilya, vol. 1, 379) and, against Gnilya, vol. 2, 304–305, 23,39 may well hold out hope for Israel⁽²⁴⁾. Even more clear is 19,28, where Jesus promises the twelve that they will sit on twelve thrones, "judging" the twelve tribes of Israel. According to Gnilya, κρίνωτες here refers not to lordship but to a one-time judgement: Israel will be condemned by the twelve at the consummation⁽²⁵⁾. Is this correct? While conceding that there are many ancient Jewish and Christian texts in which a select group of saints judges the world in the sense indicated (*I En.* 95,3; *IQH* 4,22; *1 Cor* 6,2; etc.), in Matt 19,28 κρίνω probably has the range of the Hebrew *šāpaṭ*,

⁽²⁴⁾ D. C. ALLISON, Jr., "Matt. 23,29 = Luke 13,35b as a conditional Prophecy", *JSNT* 18 (1983) 75–84.

⁽²⁵⁾ Gnilya, 171–172. Cf. J. DUPONT, "Le logion des douze trônes", *Bib* 45 (1964) 370–381.

"rule" (cf. Judg 3,10; Dan 9,12; etc.); and to sit on a throne designates the exercise of authority over a period of time (cf. *11QTemple* 56,20; Rev 3,20-21; 4,4). As the twelve phylarchs once directed the twelve tribes under Moses, and as Israel was once ruled by judges, so shall it be at the end. Compare the *Shemoneh 'Esreh*, benediction 18: "Restore our judges as in former times". A few observations:

(a) As Gnilka notes, there is no parallel to the idea that Israel will be gathered only to be condemned. It could not be otherwise. The restoration of the lost tribes was a great eschatological hope, beginning with the OT itself. It was to be a proof of God's power and faithfulness, a joyful miracle of reunion. One wonders whether Matthew's text can really be so far from Judaism that its connotations are exactly the opposite—especially as our Gospel nowhere directs polemic against Jews in the diaspora. Even if the evangelist had given up on Palestinian Jews and/or Jews in his neighbourhood, why must he have lost hope for those scattered abroad?

(b) 19,28 has almost certainly been influenced by Dan 7,9-27⁽²⁶⁾. But in Daniel the saints of the Most High take possession of the kingdom and govern (cf. Obad 21; Wis 3,7-8).

(c) In *T. Jud.* 25,1-2 and *T. Benj.* 10,7 ingathered Israel is ruled by the twelve patriarchs (cf. *T. Zeb.* 10,2). Whether the texts are Jewish or Christian is unclear, and their date is disputed. But they show that it was possible to associate the eschatological restoration with rule by a body of twelve. Related texts appear in the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g. *1QM* 2,1-3; *11QTemple* 57,11-14; *4QpIsa^d*; note also *T. Abr.* A 13,6).

(d) Luke 22,24-30, which contains the Lukan parallel to Matt 19,28, shows that at least the Third Evangelist thought in terms of the disciples ruling.

(e) In Matt 20,20-21 the mother of James and John asks Jesus to let them sit at his right hand and his left in the coming kingdom. The imagery is very close to 19,28. Yet 20,20-21 is naturally taken to be about governing, particularly in view of 20,25 ("the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them"). Is it not preferable to interpret 19,28 and 20,20-21 as referring to the same set of circumstances⁽²⁷⁾?

(f) Matt 2,6 cites 2 Sam 5,2 = 1 Chr 11,2: "who will govern my people Israel". To a first-century Jew (and Matthew was such) this would probably have conjured up the eschatological hope for Israel's restoration, the re-establishment of the twelve tribes. Thus 19,28 is not the only Matthean text to imply such expectation.

*
* * *

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. R. H. GUNDRY, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids 1982) 393.

⁽²⁷⁾ In 1 Kgs 22,19 the host of heaven is on the right and left of God's throne. Do the disciples take the place of the heavenly tribunal? See J. M. BAUMGARTEN, "The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, Revelation, and the Sanhedrin", *JBL* 95 (1976) 59-78.

In conclusion, I do not wish to leave the impression that Gnafka's fine commentary is in any way unsatisfactory. Disagreement on the three matters discussed above does not lessen admiration for a masterful contribution. *Das Matthäusevangelium* is to be gratefully welcomed. It is a worthy addition to the series which has already given us Pesch on Mark, Schürmann on Luke, and Schnackenburg on John.

2340 N. Richmond
Wichita, Kansas 67204
U.S.A.

Dale C. ALLISON, Jr.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

George W. COATS, *Moses, Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOT Supplement Series 57). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988. 254 p. 22 × 14. £ 22.50/\$ 35.00.

La figure de Moïse ne cesse de fasciner les biblistes et les travaux qui lui sont consacrés continuent à être publiés à un rythme soutenu. Il suffit de consulter deux parutions récentes des «Erträge der Forschung» pour s'en convaincre: *Exodus, Sinai und Mose*, Bd 191 (1983), de Werner H. Schmidt; *Die Gestalt des Mose*, Bd 237 (1986), de Herbert Schmid. George W. Coats présente dans la série des suppléments au *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* un ouvrage alerte qui se lit aisément, et cherche à aborder la question de Moïse par des voies nouvelles. L'auteur, connu par de nombreuses contributions, et notamment par un commentaire sur la Genèse, paru en 1983, poursuit une étude qui donne la priorité à l'examen des formes littéraires de l'Ancien Testament et en particulier à la *narration* qui prend de nos jours une importance qui dépasse de loin le champ limité des études bibliques; cf. par ex. les contributions de Paul Ricœur et le volume collectif «*La narration. Quand le récit devient communication*» (Faculté de théologie de l'université de Neuchâtel, Suisse 1988).

G. W. Coats commence par situer sa tentative par rapport à d'autres approches du problème mosaïque qui mettent l'accent sur la critique au niveau historique des sources, de J. Bright à R. de Vaux, sur l'analyse sociologique de l'intervention de Moïse, avec J. R. Porter, R. Smend, L. Perlitt parmi d'autres savants, sur les travaux d'ordre littéraire rendus célèbres par H. Gressmann, M. Noth, G. von Rad en particulier. C'est ce dernier point qui retient avant tout l'auteur; il s'agit pour lui d'analyser les traditions vétéro-testamentaires sur Moïse d'un point de vue littéraire plutôt qu'historique ou sociologique, et de mettre en évidence la ou les manières dont les premiers livres de la Bible parlent de Moïse sans chercher à établir la version la plus ancienne à son propos. G. W. Coats se propose de dégager de l'ensemble des pages qui le concernent l'image que celles-ci nous présentent de l'homme que l'on considère souvent comme le fondateur de la religion d'Israël.

George W. Coats part d'une hypothèse dont il entend vérifier le bien-fondé au cours de son ouvrage: les narrations relatives à Moïse constituent ensemble la «saga» d'un héros dont la destinée, les exploits comme les fai-

blesse, sont étroitement associés à son peuple. Mais cette «saga» se rencontre et se combine, en de savants arrangements, avec une autre représentation de la figure mosaïque, qui repose sur le credo du peuple de Yahvé confessant les actes de son Dieu en sa faveur. En bref, Moïse nous apparaît à la fois comme *le héros* et comme *l'homme de Dieu* (p. 42). Les textes en parlent tantôt comme de quelqu'un qui se met en évidence par ses initiatives, tantôt comme celui qui par son attitude accomplit avec fidélité les desseins d'une divinité qui mène l'histoire des siens.

Au terme de son enquête, G. W. Coats constate que cette dualité des portraits de Moïse parcourt tout le Pentateuque, mais qu'elle est attestée de manière différente dans les couches littéraires classiques repérées par les biblistes. C'est ainsi que, selon lui, la version sacerdotale (P) peint une image «non-héroïque» de Moïse qui est avant tout au service de Dieu; le courant deutéronomiste (D et Dtr) insiste sur Moïse le législateur qui tient son autorité de Yahvé — ce serait là un point capital et ancien de la tradition mosaïque dans le Pentateuque, qui dépasse largement l'épisode du Sinaï (cf. notamment les p. 168ss) —; le Yahviste lui (J) trace de Moïse un tableau «héroïque», qui correspond d'ailleurs à une période héroïque de l'histoire d'Israël, celle des débuts de la royauté, auxquels l'œuvre du Yahviste est liée (cf. dans un des derniers chapitres, les p. 196ss).

G. W. Coats parcourt à grands traits, mais en analysant finement les textes, les principales péripéties de la destinée de Moïse, depuis sa naissance et son séjour à Madian (chap. 2) jusqu'à sa mort entourée de mystère (chap. 8). Il relève à chaque fois les traits héroïques de la narration (ainsi l'adoption miraculeuse du nouveau-né par la fille du pharaon [Ex 2,1-10]: les éléments yahvistes de la vocation de Moïse dans Ex 3-4, alors que P élimine dans le récit parallèle [Ex 6] la dimension héroïque de l'épisode [p. 78ss], etc). Il poursuit son investigation à propos de la confrontation entre le pharaon et Moïse, l'Exode et la Pâque et relève la dualité des versions qui les concernent (cf. sa conclusion, p. 108); il étudie les rôles respectifs de Dieu et de Moïse lors du séjour au désert où se combinent les initiatives du second, selon J, avec la conduite des événements par le premier, selon P (cf. en particulier p. 124). Les chapitres suivants confirment les premières observations de G. W. Coats et permettent à celui-ci de conclure, dans des pages particulièrement intéressantes (p. 155ss), que la narration biblique nous présente deux manières de dire la vie et l'œuvre de Moïse qui, tout au long des premiers livres de l'Écriture, se succèdent, entrent en tension, se mêlent et s'associent. La version héroïque, caractéristique de la «saga», met au premier plan l'activité de Moïse; elle est complétée, voire corrigée par une autre interprétation des événements qui laisse à Dieu l'initiative et fait de Moïse un exécutant fidèle de la volonté divine. On comparera par exemple des déclarations comme Ex 32,1b.7.11 ou Ex 3,7s.9s; on constatera que, selon Dt 34,11s, les exploits de Moïse sont étroitement liés à ceux de Yahvé et que le bâton de Moïse, qui atteste sa puissance, est qualifié de «bâton de Dieu» (Ex 17,1ss.9; cf. p. 165, 186ss), si bien que les interventions divines finissent par s'exprimer à travers l'œuvre de Moïse. George W. Coats remarque également que les deux traditions dont il a mis en évidence les propriétés respectives réagissent l'une sur l'autre; le héros, selon J, devient le serviteur fidèle de P; l'interpré-

tation confessante, qui souligne la part décisive jouée par Yahvé dans la destinée des siens et qui serait d'origine cultuelle, perd son caractère institutionnel initial lorsqu'elle est unie à la narration héroïque et prend un tour populaire et folklorique (cf. par ex., p. 167ss).

Deux excursus terminent cet ouvrage, l'un traite des épithètes attribuées à Moïse (l'homme de Dieu; le serviteur de Dieu), l'autre relève l'importance de divers éléments associés à Moïse, comme le bâton. Quelques pages à la fin du livre permettent à l'auteur d'établir une certaine relation entre la figure de Moïse et celle de Jésus; enfin des index facilitent l'utilisation d'un travail qu'on lira avec profit.

Sans avoir repris en détail toute la démonstration de G. W. Coats, nous espérons avoir montré l'intérêt de son entreprise. George W. Coats renouvelle ou mieux rajeunit l'approche méthodologique d'une des figures centrales de l'Ancien Testament. Il montre la fécondité d'une étude fondée sur l'examen des formes littéraires du témoignage biblique, ce qui n'exclut nullement que des questions d'ordre historique et sociologique restent posées. Il tient compte, avec nuance, des sources classiques retenues par la critique; on notera à ce sujet que l'Elohiste joue un rôle minime pour lui et qu'il attribue une haute antiquité au Yahviste, ce qui ne va pas de soi aujourd'hui. On dira surtout qu'il donne une explication plausible à un phénomène qui ne peut manquer de frapper tout lecteur attentif du Pentateuque: pourquoi Moïse apparaît-il tantôt comme le sujet principal de la destinée de ses frères, tantôt comme un simple instrument entre les mains de son Dieu? Dans la réponse qu'il présente, G. W. Coats indique avec raison — et ce n'est pas sans importance théologique — que les deux versions de l'œuvre de Moïse qui nous sont proposées ne s'excluent pas, mais se complètent. Nous n'avons pas à choisir l'une contre l'autre, mais à les combiner ou mieux à les prendre l'une et l'autre au sérieux.

106, route de Ferney
CH-1202 Genève

Robert MARTIN-ACHARD

André WÉNIN, *Samuel et l'instauration de la monarchie (1 S 1-12)*.

Une recherche littéraire sur le personnage (Publications Universitaires Européennes Série XXIII, Théologie, Vol. 342). Bern, Peter Lang, 1988. 490 p. 14,8 x 21. FS 76.

In this book, a doctoral thesis presented at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in 1987, André Wénin offers readers a character study of Samuel during a crucial period in Israel's history, the birth of the monarchy. The text of Wénin's analysis is 1 Samuel 1-12. As Wénin suggests, this is the proper context for any study of the events that culminate in Saul's coronation. Wénin's approach to the text is literary, essentially the process of careful analysis now well known as "close reading". Wénin adds to such careful reading a special awareness of formal literary structures—inevitably, when

one reads the Bible, chiasmus and parallelism—and the bearing of literary allusions to other passages in the Bible. According to Wénin (p. 14) a good reading must be careful to study the particular subject, here the character of Samuel, in the light of its overarching narrative context. Hence the special concern for larger narrative structures (e.g. the parallelism of chs. 1–7 and chs. 8–12 [p. 249] and the scenic parallelism of ch. 4 and 7,13–14 [p. 85]) and inner-biblical allusion (e.g. Yahweh's allusions to the exodus in 1 Sam 9,15–16 [pp. 178–179]). Wénin sees his approach as not necessarily hostile to historical criticism: it is simply a different avenue of biblical study (p. 15).

Wénin's reading of Samuel's character follows, for the most part, the narrative's own sequencing of events. This is a good reading strategy even for something like character analysis. As a medium of representation, narrative is inherently sequential and this affects all aspects of its stories. Such is especially true for Samuel, a character who seems to undergo marked development in the course of his life. Wénin's unitary reading of the career changes that Samuel experiences is a response to historical-critical efforts to use his multiple roles—priest, judge, prophet, and seer—as an entrance to the literary history of the text. He suggests (p. 17), correctly in my view, that all of Samuel's roles are presented under the aegis of his primary occupation as covenantal mediator—not a formal office, but the role that Samuel always plays no matter what he does.

For Wénin, Samuel is an exceptionally dutiful covenant mediator (e.g. pp. 254–256) whose one slip (disobedience to Yahweh in 1 Sam 8) is a consequence of the impossible situation that he faces. When the people ask Samuel to set a king over them and Yahweh seems to accede, Samuel tries, instead, to dissuade them. Failing that, he sends them away empty-handed. In Wénin's view (p. 134–135) this lapse is understandable. As mediator, Samuel is asked to abolish the role that he embodies and which he has only firmly held since 1 Sam 7. Samuel's dysfunction as mediator in ch. 8 is logical. The request and his duty are mutually contradictory: he cannot do it because in doing it his official capacity to do anything is nullified. This is a very subtle reading, maybe too subtle (though I do not count myself among those who reject subtlety in biblical literature). It, along with many other observations about Samuel's role, reveals a certain sympathy for this character and, most important, for the theocratic viewpoint that he represents. The question is: does Wénin weight his reading more heavily in favour of Samuel's (and God's) point of view than the narrative allows? In Wénin's reading both God and Samuel are exculpated of any wrongdoing. Whatever blame there is for the rough passage of events lies heavily on the shoulders of the Israelites, specifically their elders (pp. 145–147). I wonder whether this reading can be brought into accord with the narrator's own dispassionate neutrality, which Wénin does note (e.g. pp. 252–253), in viewing the events of the story.

In his closing remarks on method Wénin lists three things that are crucial to a good reading of biblical narrative (pp. 257–258):

1. Formal analysis of structure, which clarifies repetitions and draws attention to parallels and contrasts—favourite expositional devices,

2. Attention to questions of voice structure (narrative ontology) in narrative,

3. Attention to the relationship between the narrator and the implied reader (or more correctly between the implied author and the implied reader) and to the contribution of reader response to the creation of narrative meaning.

These are all good principles of narratology and Wénin does well to remind us of them. The great strength of Wénin's reading is in the careful attention he pays to item one, formal analysis of structure. He presents many new insights into this aspect of the text, all of which have an important bearing on a careful reader's understanding of the story. On the other hand, a weakness of Wénin's reading is the lesser attention devoted to the latter two items. This same weakness is reflected in Wénin's bibliography and citations of theoretical works on what can loosely be called the question of "point of view". Works listed on narrative theory are few in number and even then are restricted, with one exception, to the work of biblical scholars who themselves work at one remove from the primary theoretical work on narrative literature (biblical scholars working on literary approaches to the Bible: L. Alonso Schökel, R. Alter, S. Bar Efrat, A. Berlin, G. B. Caird, C. Conroy, L. Eslinger, J. P. Fokkelman, M. Garstiel, E. M. Good, D. M. Gunn, J. Licht, R. Polzin, J. G. Williams; the exception, M. Sternberg, is only lightly touched upon).

To give just one example of the difficulties that arise without careful consideration of the issues involved in narrative voice structures, Wénin says that to understand the divine rationale for the disastrous battle against the Philistines in 1 Sam 4 the reader must turn to Samuel's observations on the matter in ch. 7. Why should a reader listen to a highly-involved character, whose authority has been snubbed in the course of the events in question (according to Wénin, pp. 97-98), for authoritative comment on such a decisive issue? According to Wénin the answer lies in the narrator's choice to use Samuel's voice to pronounce the proper assessment of the affair (p. 94). Wénin finds in Samuel's explanation—Israel had sinned prior to and during the battle against the Philistines according to Wénin's reading of Samuel's rhetoric (pp. 92-98)—the only plausible understanding of what had happened. Since it is the only *explicit* explanation in the narrative and since Samuel's view fits the pattern of a common A.N.E. interpretation of defeat in battle, the narrator must be using Samuel to voice his own view (pp. 93-94). Here Wénin's reading flies directly in the face of the narrative situation—an external, unconditioned narrator totally separate and far removed from any character's existential involvement in the story—that has prevailed throughout 1 Samuel and before that throughout Joshua and Judges, and before them, throughout the Pentateuch. It will not do, therefore, simply to assert that here the narrator speaks through Samuel. That needs a lot of proving; without it, the reader must operate under the reigning voice structure and that means seeing Samuel's explanation for what it is: the biased interpretation of the snubbed theocrat, Samuel. After all, Samuel is quite capable of sharing the common, theocratically attractive manner of viewing defeat in battle ac-

cording to one of the conventional A.N.E. patterns on his own, without narratorial support. That is especially true when the prior description of the battle lacks any *explicit* information to support Samuel's interpretation; Wénin's efforts to buttress Samuel's reading rely on an impressive, but forceful reading between the lines (pp. 95-98). Nevertheless, as Wénin notes, much in our understanding of these stories depends on how we evaluate Israel's actions during and prior to the first battle with the Philistines in 1 Sam 4, a difficult and contentious issue to be sure.

Having made the assumption of univocality between the views of Samuel and the narrator once, Wénin goes on to make more unexamined assumptions of essential agreements between the narrator and Samuel and Yahweh. That is, he sees the narrative supporting the views voiced by Samuel and Yahweh even when it appears on the surface that there is something wrong or odd about what they have to say (e.g., of Yahweh's characterization of Saul as the new Moses in 9,15-16 [pp. 178-180]; of Samuel's blatant revision of history in ch. 12,12 [pp. 223-224]: in both cases, the foregrounded oddity of which Wénin perceives, the narrator has taken pains to make the character's bias stand out). As a result of his assumptions about voicing in 1 Samuel 1-12, Wénin's reading of the events, especially as they impinge on the question of the monarchy, is skewed. Instead of the overarching, conventional objectivity of the narrator we get a reading more through the eyes of Samuel and Yahweh: between the two views there is a world of difference.

Perhaps it is too much to ask of any close reader to pay careful attention to all aspects of the complex form of biblical narrative. Even for his careful work on structure alone Wénin is to be congratulated and thanked for the progress that he has made in improving our understanding of Samuel and this passage in biblical narrative. On top of that he adds a stimulating, if in my view faulted, reading of the narrative's overarching meaning and especially of the role of Samuel's and Yahweh's voices in shaping that meaning. All who read his study will learn a great deal from it. Readers would do well, however, to devote some careful consideration to the subjects of narrative ontology and voice structure as they consider Wénin's suggestions about how the narrative presents the actors and events leading to the birth of the monarchy. Whatever reading of this narrative scholars are able to agree on, if any, the question of voicing must be paramount in our deliberations.

The University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta
Canada T2N 1N4

Lyle ESLINGER

Kathleen M. O'CONNOR, *The Confessions of Jeremiah: Their Interpretation and Role in Chapters 1-25* (SBL Dissertation Series 94). Atlanta GA, Scholars Press, 1988. xv-183 p. 14×21,5. \$ 14.95.

The complexities facing the would-be interpreter of the Jeremiah traditions are manifold. Not the least of these is the clarification of the redactional processes and intentions that produced the book in its present form. Research has oscillated between compositional models discerning sophisticated, coherent, and overarching theological processes in the formation of the prophetic book and those that discern a loose anthology of materials with haphazard redactional activity of limited scope.

O'Connor's study clearly positions itself in this larger debate with those who see a more coherent handling of the traditions incorporated into the book of Jeremiah. As such her work should be compared with a number of recent studies of the Confessions by N. Ittmann, F. Ahuis, F. Hubmann, and A. Diamond.

Her chief concern is to elucidate the function and significance of the Confessions within their present literary framework (Jer 1-25). Her basic thesis is that the Confessions have been deliberately and systematically anchored in chapters 11-20 by the "prose writer" of the book in the process of constructing an extended argument, theologically justifying Yahweh's destruction of the nation. The call narrative (Jer 1) is programmatic, introducing the major themes of the collection. Chapters 2-10 set forth the prophet's indictment of the nation with the corresponding threat of judgment if repentance is not forthcoming. Chapters 11-20 portray the nation's rejection of this appeal. The Confessions play a crucial role in this regard, for they pick up and carry forward the theme of rejection and persecution of the prophet, as well as his ultimate vindication signaled in chapter 1. Thus the destruction of the nation is legitimized. The remaining chapters, 21-25, function as an appendix to 1-20, providing "survival instructions" to the community in the aftermath of the disaster.

The defense of this thesis is worked out in three stages: first a detailed exegesis of each Confession, arguing a common theme of prophetic legitimation for each. Then the Confessions are considered as an independent collection of poems. A public function of legitimation within the circle of Jeremiah's disciples is discerned. Finally there is an examination of the function and significance of the Confessions in their immediate and extended literary contexts (11-20, 1-25, respectively). In their immediate context, each unit is juxtaposed to a prose sermon to provide concrete illustration of the sermon motif, "refusal to hear". Their function in the extended literary context is explained as noted in the previous paragraph.

In light of the current difficulties associated with the construction of an adequate compositional model for the book of Jeremiah, my remarks will be designed to highlight those features particularly relevant to such questions.

O'Connor's exegesis of the Confessions combines the methods of Form, Redaction, and Rhetorical criticism in a manner that at times seems incon-

sistent in execution or unwarranted in the way it subordinates one critical perspective to the other. O'Connor discerns only five Confessional units (11,18-12,6; 15,10-21; 17,14-18; 18,18-23; 20,7-13) giving primary emphasis to rhetorical analysis in the delimitation of them. In this, she has failed to discern the formal pattern of complaint-plus-answering oracle that repeats itself four times across 11,18-12,6 and 15,10-21.

On the other hand, 20,14-18 is excluded from the Confessions, this time subordinating rhetorical to formal considerations. But this seems inconsistent with both redactional and rhetorical factors. O'Connor argues that it is the historical prophet who speaks in the Confessions. This seems to be the crucial rhetorical point for delimiting the units. O'Connor's five units already exhibit a certain amount of formal diversity. The basis, then, for connecting these texts with each other lies in the valid thematic observation that all of these poems reflect a prophetic struggle with the prophetic mission not simple formal conformity. Thus excluding 20,14-18 from the Confessions because of its formal distinctiveness is an insufficient criterion. Nor does this give sufficient consideration to its redactional placement immediately next to 20,7-13 or to the many rhetorical-thematic connections with the earlier Confessions.

For O'Connor, detailed exegesis of the Confessions reveals that they should be viewed as literature of legitimation similar in role to that of prophetic call narratives. The theme of the Confessions has an "intrinsic public function". It provides a portrayal of Jeremiah that dissociates him from his prophetic opponents. "The more likely arena for the recitation of the confessions would have been among those who supported him but who may have been losing faith in him due to his apparent failure" (p. 95).

This is a very attractive and certainly possible proposal, representing a reformulation of a line argued in previous studies, but it has not been adequately argued with respect to probability. Again, problems rise of a formal nature. Once the connection to cultic-complaint is accepted, more attention must be given to problems raised by the opaque, stereotypical quality of the diction common to such poetry. Most of the Confessions (11,18-20; 12,1-5; 15,10-12; 18,19-23; 20,14-18) contain no unambiguous references that would help a reader or listener infer any themes relevant to prophetic mission. O'Connor underestimates the ambiguity of the diction as an indicator of problems of prophetic legitimation. This is not to deny that some of the other passages do contain unambiguous references to matters prophetic (20,7-10; 17,15; 15,16.19).

This, in turn, suggests that the essential role of editorial expansion and placement for fixing the opacity of idioms in reference to matters of prophetic mission has also been underestimated. O'Connor posits only 11,21-23; 12,6; 15,13-14.21 (?); and 18,18 as editorial additions. It is precisely these additions (granting for the sake of argument O'Connor's analysis) or the placement of the ambiguous poems in proximity to the unambiguous which provide the reader/listener with sufficient hermeneutical clues to make the concrete connection to Jeremiah's mission. In short, to get the legitimation theme clear, the passages need each other within the editorial framework provided for them.

If the prior existence of the Confessions as an independent literary collection, as O'Connor argues, could be demonstrated, then the force of these problems would be reduced. But upon what basis does such a hypothesis become warranted? It is not sufficient to point to rhetorically significant literary patterns (p. 89) or to a coherent progression of theme (p. 93). This is to substitute poetics (literary artistry) for genetics (compositional history). There is not always a clear line between these two features of a text. Analysis of present literary artistry cannot indicate whether this coherence derived from an earlier stage of the compositional process or from the latest redactional stage. And if, as O'Connor argues, the editorial expansions and placement of the Confessions across 11-20 are the result of the single "prose writer", why not also the pattern of serialization of the passages as well? Some other evidence must be provided in order to suggest that the Confessional series is an inherited one from prior stages of the tradition.

Furthermore, the proposed setting and function within the circle of the prophet's supporters is problematic. It is not clear that the subject matter and tone of the Confessions is truly apposite for this. O'Connor's very attractive theory works best with 20,7-13 with its shift of tone from despair to confidence, or with those passages containing some type of confirmatory divine response. (This applies only to 15,12 once the editorially constructed oracles are eliminated.) But the dramatic situations of the remaining poems are ones where the fulfillment of the prophetic word is outstanding (18,19-23; 17,14-18); or the plea for deliverance is left unanswered (11,18-19); or the prophet acts as blasphemer, challenging Yahweh's integrity and the justice of the prophetic mission (12,1-4; 15,15-18) with the divine response one of rebuke or challenge (12,5; 15,19-20). It is very difficult to see how the confidence of Jeremiah's supporters would have been boosted by such texts — especially *within* the continuing crisis situation engendered by prophetic conflict prior to 586 BCE. In this regard, the way in which these texts reflect on the nature of prophetic vocation and its legitimation seems to fit best where the turn of historical events has already shown who the authentic prophet is but where there still is need to explain the peculiarities in the situation and prophetic vocation which made discernment of legitimacy problematic.

It is the third stage of O'Connor's study which represents the most significant advance over older approaches. The latter attempted to construct a context of meaning for the Confessions in the reconstructed historical-biographical setting of the prophet's life. O'Connor adequately demonstrates the failures of these older approaches as well as the need for a reading sensitive to literary context. O'Connor's study also represents an advance over more recent studies which, like hers, attempt to explore the role of the Confessions in 11-20 (cf. Hubmann and Diamond) by extending the exploration of context to the whole of 1-25. Thus she makes possible a hypothesis which offers a rationale for the restriction of the Confessions to 11-20.

Her thesis that Confessional material has been significantly juxtaposed to surrounding prose sermon material in order to illustrate the theme of the failure to heed the prophetic mission is persuasive. But in the process of criticising Thiel's concept of stylized scenes of prophetic mission (*Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1-25* [Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973]), she

has too hastily discarded the entire notion and thus failed to see the more elaborate dramatic situations that have been constructed in the immediate context to further this theodicy motif. For example in 15,10-21, the focus within the Confession is not placed so much on the rejection and persecution of the prophet as on the prophet's own struggle with and attempted repudiation of the nature of his mission as one of opposition to the nation. And this seems to fit very nicely with the prophet's dramatic role within the "drought liturgy" (14,1-15,9) where he debates with the message of inevitable judgement as one who would intercede for the nation's forgiveness. In this regard, O'Connor's reading of the Confessions in their immediate context is too flat and perhaps of a piece with the tendency not to do justice to the actual dramatic situation enacted within each Confession.

The underlying issue here is how to view the manner in which the editor(s) has worked with the traditional materials. This takes us back to the competing models postulated for the formation of the book of Jeremiah. O'Connor sees the "prose writer" working with a clear, coherent theological intention, at times supporting thematic developments with carefully structured blocks of material in 11-20 (esp. for 11-12, 14-16, and 18-20). Yet she struggles with how thoroughly the editor has pursued this creative handling of the material in his compositional technique, for she must also use descriptions of the prose writer's method such as "episodic", "incoherent", "circling" over against "linearly progressing" (p. 147). This tension is perceived even more strongly for the structural arrangement of 2-10 (p. 127). More work needs to be carried out to resolve these tensions if such compositional models as O'Connor's are to succeed in explaining those features which give rise to alternative models such as McKane's concept of a "rolling corpus".

In this regard, especially problematic is the elucidation of thematic coherence and development in 2-10. To view its design as portraying the prophet initially issuing dire warnings and urgent appeals to repent, becoming progressively more pessimistic in outlook, does not give adequate attention to the pessimism about repentance expressed from the outset in Jer 2. The contextual association of summons to repentance with statements indicating the rejection of this appeal also frustrates the scheme of development. It is interesting that Jer 1 contains no reference to repentance, given the programmatic, introductory function posited by O'Connor. Too many other themes signaled in chapter 1 and/or raised in 2-10 are left unaccounted for in O'Connor's scheme.

Further attention, as well, must be given to the basis for discerning sections and subsections in the material — an issue not merely for O'Connor, but also for similar approaches. If there are rhetorical connections across units, how do we tell what features subdivide from those which create overarching connections? And how are we to combine a vision of complex redactional development with a vision of significant rhetorical-theological coherence in the present form of the text?

The latter brings us to underlying theoretical issues raised by such studies as O'Connor's. How are we to correlate perspectives on the text derived from attention to the poetics of the final form with perspectives produced by

attention to the genetics or compositional history of the text? Should poetic and genetic models of the text be generated from each other? Does the discernment of a sophisticated poesis of the final form require us to postulate a single hand — i.e., a “prose writer” — as agent responsible for it? The converse must be asked of genetic models, postulating a complex, extended history of composition. Could one stage or form of prophetic tradition play a determinative role upon subsequent stages, acting as its own subject, creating its own coherence, even though it historically is a product of numerous editorial hands and intentions?

Finally, the criticisms and questions posed in this review are not meant as disparagements of O'Connor's valuable study. On the contrary, her work is an important contribution to the on-going dialogue over the complexities of the Jeremiah tradition. Her work is incisive in its perception of the questions that must be addressed. Her central conclusions provide constructive stimulation to further analysis and research. It is in the spirit of furthering such dialogue that this review is offered.

Westmont College
Department of Religious Studies
955 La Paz Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108 U.S.A.

A. R. Pete DIAMOND

Federico PÉREZ CASTRO, *El código de Profetas de El Cairo*. Tomo VI. *Ezequiel*. (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 44). Madrid, Instituto de Filología, C.S.I.C., 1988. 235 p. 27,8 × 19,2.

L'équipe «Biblia Hebraea» de l'Instituto Arias Montano, aujourd'hui Instituto de Filología, du Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, s'est fait un nom depuis des années en matière d'éditions de la Bible en hébreu et en araméen. Les publications exceptionnelles de A. Díez Macho (pas seulement du Codex Neofiti) ne devraient pas faire oublier les autres entreprises. En 1979, commençait de paraître, sous la direction du professeur F. Pérez Castro, l'édition du codex des Prophètes du Caire (C dans *BHS*), avec les Petits Prophètes (t. VII) et une préface. Ensuite ce furent Josué et Juges (t. I, 1980), Samuel (t. II, 1983), les Rois (t. III, 1984), Isaïe (t. IV, 1986), Jérémie (t. V, 1987) et finalement Ezéchiel. Dans la collection des *Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros»*, il s'agit des vol. 20, 26, 30, 31, 36, 37 et 44. Un index alphabétique de la massore (t. VIII) est en préparation. Une telle entreprise a une histoire, on s'en doute; elle a été racontée par Emilia Fernández Tejero au V^{ème} Congrès de l'*International Organization for Masoretic Studies*.

L'édition, fondée sur des photographies et un microfilm de l'Université Hébraïque de Jérusalem, avait pu être revue pour les t. I et VII après consultation de manuscrit lui-même au Caire en mai 1978. Dans la suite, l'original n'a plus pu être examiné.

Faut-il le rappeler, le manuscrit des Prophètes du Caire est un des plus célèbres *codices* de la Bible hébraïque, à côté du manuscrit de Leningrad et de celui d'Alep, et il forme avec eux le groupe caractérisé de la famille des Ben-Asher. Il est le plus ancien témoin du système élaboré de vocalisation et de cantilation qui devait prévaloir. Il justifiait indiscutablement une attention particulière.

Le présent volume contient donc (après un rappel des abréviations) la transcription soignée d'Ezéchiel accompagnée de deux appareils, le premier consacré à l'édition de la grande massore (MM) et de la petite massore (MP), le second consacré à d'autres indications marginales ou à des explications de l'éditeur. Le premier appareil (massorétique) signale l'origine des formes citées selon notre système de référence (2 Sam 14,27 par ex.). Sur la précision de ce travail d'édition et d'identification, Aron Dotan, orfèvre en la matière, a pu écrire qu'un contrôle confirme «an extraordinary precise and careful work exhibiting a profound understanding of the Masora» («The Cairo Codex of Prophets and its Spanish Edition», *Sefarad* 46 [1986] 161-175; voir 173).

Evidemment, l'une des premières tâches sera de comparer le MS. du Caire avec ceux de Leningrad et d'Alep. Le «scriptorium» de Madrid s'est déjà mis à l'ouvrage, et je note deux travaux récents, l'un de Emilia Fernández Tejero, «Corregido y correcto. La segunda mano del codice de profetas de El Cairo en el libro de Profetas Menores», *Sefarad* 46 (1986) 191-196, et, de la même avec Maria Teresa Ortega Monasterio, «Las Masoras de A, C y L en el libro de Nahum», *Sefarad* (1981) 27-69.

Notre tâche de recenseur doit être ici de mettre en évidence le sens et la portée de cette édition dans les recherches sur la transmission de la Bible hébraïque. Depuis P. Kahle, on a compris que la massore est propre à un manuscrit donné, qu'elle fonctionne avec ses particularités de vocalisation et qu'elle ne peut être séparée. C'est la raison principale pour laquelle les dernières éditions critiques de la Bible hébraïque se fondent dorénavant sur un seul manuscrit, choisi le meilleur possible, en l'occurrence Leningrad B 19a, et cela depuis R. Kittel (*BHK*³, 1929-1937). La valeur du codex du Caire, limité aux *Nebi'im*, est au moins aussi grande. Il est aussi soigné que L; il est plus ancien (827 après la destruction du Temple, soit 896 selon Dotan, 895 d'après Kahle); il s'en distingue sur des points qui peuvent paraître des minuties, mais qui, à une date aussi ancienne, au moment où le système se cristallise, méritent toute l'attention du spécialiste. Les massores, si elles sont voisines, fonctionnent cependant indépendamment.

Une fois reconnue l'importance de la vocalisation du manuscrit du Caire, la question se pose de la reproduire. Des éditions en fac-similé ont été données pour les trois témoins, et donc aussi pour C: *Codex Cairo of the Bible from the Karaite Synagogue at Abbasiya*. Introd. by D. S. Löwinger [Jérusalem 1971] 2 vol.). Mais n'oublions pas que le texte consonantique n'est qu'exceptionnellement en cause. Quant aux signes de vocalisation et de cantilation, l'intervention d'un réviseur est toujours possible, et leur lisibilité, même sur l'original, n'est pas sans poser des problèmes délicats. Irremplaçable, l'édition en fac-similé n'apporte donc pas la solution à toutes les questions. Une édition au sens classique, diplomatique éventuellement, est donc parfaitement utile dans un cas comme celui-ci. Non seulement elle propose la lecture de ce

qui apparaît mal sur l'original ou sur la photographie, mais elle peut se permettre des explications (développer la massore) et des justifications (en cas de lecture douteuse ou d'intervention d'une autre main). L'édition complète donc la photographie et fait bénéficier le lecteur de l'expérience de l'éditeur. On regrettera évidemment que celui-ci n'ait pas pu recourir à l'original autant qu'il aurait fallu; en revanche, il a consacré des efforts considérables à éclaircir la massore. Il aurait pu aussi noter la référence aux pages et aux colonnes du codex, ce qui aurait permis un contrôle plus aisé sur le fac-similé. Mais il ne s'agit pas d'une édition diplomatique, même si la configuration des lignes est respectée. Les contraintes générales de l'imprimerie n'auraient guère permis une telle solution. Ici, même les *qeré* sont placés avec la massore dans l'apparat. Quoi qu'il en soit, les éditeurs rejoignent donc une tendance actuelle consistant à éditer pour lui-même chaque témoin important d'un texte, ce qui autorise une vue simultanée et complète des phénomènes d'ordre divers (orthographe, grammaire, abréviations, mais surtout divisions, titres et tout ce qui touche à la présentation éditoriale) qui disparaissent presque nécessairement dans une édition critique à partir de plusieurs témoins. Ici il faut de plus protéger le lien indissoluble qui unit le manuscrit à sa massore. Deux questions délicates restent à résoudre.

Dans l'article déjà cité, Aron Dotan explique pourquoi les Prophètes du Caire, appartenant selon le colophon à l'école de Ben-Asher, se singularisent par une proportion importante des usages reconnus comme ceux de Ben-Nephtali (*bisrā' él* pour *b'yiśrā' él*, par ex.). Attribuant les colophons à deux mains différentes, ce qui est justifié, il estime pouvoir réserver à Moïse ben Asher la copie du texte consonantique et à l'auteur anonyme d'un colophon écrit d'une autre main la vocalisation et la massore. On s'expliquerait ainsi la dérive vers les usages de Ben-Nephtali. Cette explication est possible, mais elle n'est pas certaine, car le paradoxe qu'elle vise à éliminer ne l'est ainsi que partiellement: le colophon de 2^{me} main est à la 1^{re} pers. du pl. et suggère l'accord du scribe et de son *naqdan*-massorète.

Autre énigme. P. Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza* [Oxford 1959] 97) et, tout récemment encore, A. Schenker («Die Lehre vom Ursprung des biblischen Schrift- und Aussprachesystems im Kairoer Prophetenkode und das karäische Bekenntnis Mosche Ben Aschers», *Judaica* 43 [1987] 238-247) ont fait valoir que le codex n'est pas seulement karaïte du fait de son histoire ultérieure, mais dès ses origines. En effet, la doctrine même du deuxième colophon, dont l'originalité est reconnue par A. Dotan, est karaïte selon A. Schenker. Voilà qui oblige à soulever une nouvelle fois la question des relations entre rabbanites et karaïtes à haute époque. Ces derniers, qui tenaient pour révélées les lettres et la prononciation, avaient plus de raisons que les rabbanites de perfectionner et de fixer un système de vocalisation dont on avait pu largement se passer jusque là.

Une véritable édition critique de la Bible hébraïque n'existera pas avant longtemps. Pour l'heure, nous devons nous contenter de fac-similés, d'éditions manuelles (*BHK*³, *BHS*, Dotan) ou d'éditions telles que celle-ci. Mais elles tournent toutes autour de trois témoins d'une école, Tibériade, d'une famille, les Ben-Asher. Pour évaluer le reste, tout le reste de la tradition, nous disposons des collations anciennes de Kennicott et de Rossi, et de l'édi-

tion de C. G. Ginsburg: c'est mieux que rien, mais c'est peu sûr. Il faut s'en faire une raison. Il y aurait à accomplir pour la Bible hébraïque ce que A. Rahlfs a fait pour la Septante, ce que S. Berger avait commencé pour la Bible latine, un inventaire raisonné des témoins, avec description de l'ordre des livres, du type de vocalisation, et de bien d'autres particularités notées occasionnellement par Ginsburg, tel le compte des psaumes (L en compte 149 en unissant 114 et 115, comme *BHS* permet de le voir; Alep fait de même, mais sans numéros). Il y aurait aussi à mettre en relation ces particularités éditoriales des Bibles (dont évidemment leurs massores) avec les commentaires de même époque.

Pour l'heure, en proposant aux chercheurs ce volume à l'impression soignée, doté d'un beau caractère hébreu très lisible et d'une accentuation très distincte (ce n'est pas une mince affaire), l'équipe de Madrid fournit à la critique textuelle de la Bible hébraïque un instrument austère, mais solide.

Abbaye de Maredsous
B-5198 Denée
Belgique

Pierre-Maurice BOGAERT

John E. HARTLEY, *The Book of Job* (NICOT). Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1988. XIV-591 p. 14,3 × 22. £ 19.50.

El lector de lengua inglesa no puede quejarse por falta de comentarios al libro de Job. Sólo en este siglo han aparecido los de Driver-Gray (1921), Ball (1922), Buttenwieser (1922), Kissane (1939), Pope (1965, con ediciones posteriores), Tur-Sinai (1967), Rowley (1970), Gordis (1978), Habel (1985). Sin contar con las traducciones al inglés de los comentarios clásicos de Ewald (1882), Franz Delitzsch (1973) y Dhorme (1984). Obras de enfoque muy distinto, y de variada dimensión, pero que ofrecen la posibilidad de adentrarse en los complejos problemas de este difícil y apasionante libro bíblico. A todos ellos se pueden y deben añadir numerosos estudios y artículos en dicha lengua. A esta larga serie se une la obra que ahora comentamos.

Antes de emitir un juicio, permítaseme una reflexión. El libro de Job plantea especiales problemas al comentarista. Es un libro apasionado sobre un tema apasionante. El intérprete debe dejarse arrastrar por esa pasión, y esforzarse por transmitir al lector su angustia, su belleza, la fuerza de sus imágenes, la dureza del debate, la complejidad de los argumentos, para que él mismo termine enfrentado al enigma del sufrimiento y de la justicia de Dios. La tarea, nada fácil en sí misma, se ve dificultada por los problemas de la traducción y, sobre todo, por la enorme extensión del texto. Dudo que alguien haya leído de corrida, incluso en pocas sesiones, el libro de Job. Es más para ser meditado y saboreado. Por eso, cualquier juicio sobre un comentario a Job debe ser escrito con enorme respeto y comprensión hacia el comentarista.

Hartley dirige su obra a «pastores, profesores y estudiantes», dejando claro desde el principio que se centrará en la interpretación del mensaje teológico más que en el comentario lingüístico (p. vii). Esto no debe engañar a nadie, pensando que se trata de un comentario «pastoral» o «piadoso», dicho sea con todo respeto a ese tipo de comentarios. Hartley ha llevado a cabo su tarea con gran seriedad y amplitud, incluso en las cuestiones filológicas en las que no pretende centrarse.

Siguiendo el esquema clásico, divide su obra en una larga introducción (1-63) y el comentario propiamente dicho (64-545). La obra termina con unos índices muy completos de temas, autores, citas bíblicas y extrabíblicas, palabras hebreas, acádicas y ugaríticas (547-591).

La introducción trata los temas habituales: título y lugar en el canon, texto y versiones, lenguaje, paralelos del Antiguo Oriente, afinidades con otros libros del Antiguo Testamento, autor, fecha, aspectos literarios, poesía, estructura y géneros, mensaje, esbozo del contenido del libro y bibliografía selecta. Destacaría las páginas sobre las afinidades con otros libros del Antiguo Testamento (por la claridad incluso tipográfica con que aparecen) y las referentes a los géneros y el mensaje. En cuanto a la fecha, se inclina por el siglo VII (a algunos les parecerá demasiado temprana).

El capítulo sobre los aspectos literarios está enfocado no desde el punto de vista del análisis literario moderno, sino del análisis de fuentes. Indico algunas conclusiones de interés: a) Las tensiones del prólogo las resuelve admitiendo que el autor recogió y adaptó un relato antiguo («an old epic») para utilizarla como marco de los discursos. Es una postura frecuente y la que considero más sensata. b) En el conflictivo tercer ciclo de discursos adopta una postura bastante original: Sofar nunca tuvo un tercer discurso. De los comentaristas que conozco, algunos habían eliminado ya a este amigo de Job de la tercera rueda (Siegfried, Volz, Lefèvre, Tournay, Fohrer, Kaiser, Fedrizzi, Brates, etc.), pero lo hacían movidos por las dificultades de distribuir estos capítulos entre los tres protagonistas. El motivo de Hartley es distinto: está convencido de que Sofar nunca tuvo un tercer discurso y piensa que el autor del libro alargó su segundo discurso como señal de que no volvería a hablar. El tercer discurso de Bildad lo amplía añadiendo 27,13-23 a 25,1-6 (cosa que tampoco coincide con ningún comentarista, aunque se acerca bastante a las posturas de Ley y Bickell), y la octava respuesta de Job la reduce a 26,1-14 + 27,2-12. Estas opciones pueden resultar discutibles, pero debemos reconocer que los problemas son tan grandes que cualquier solución deja insatisfechos. c) El himno a la sabiduría (c. 28) cree que está en el mejor sitio posible dentro del libro, refleja el estilo del autor y debe ser admitido como parte integrante de la obra original. Dentro de las dificultades, también esta decisión resulta sensata y aceptable. d) Con respecto a los discursos de Eliú, admite dos hipótesis: que son obra del autor en una etapa posterior de reflexión sobre el problema, o que los escribió un discípulo, y el maestro los retocó e incorporó a su obra. e) Finalmente, admite que los dos discursos de Yahvé son auténticos, parte integrante de la estructura y del mensaje de la obra.

En líneas generales estoy de acuerdo con la mayoría de las afirmaciones del autor en la introducción. Sin ánimo de crítica, con simple deseo de com-

pletar su información, indicaría lo siguiente. En pág. 8, nota 8: la tercera edición de *ANET* (1969) 596-600 completa el texto del «Job babilónico» con el fragmento K 9392. En pág. 9, nota 10 falta indicar que la traducción del texto publicado por Nougayrol (R.S. 25460) ha sido mejorada por Von Soden en *UF* 1 (1969) 191-193. Pág. 11, nota 15: el influjo de Job en la literatura moderna lo ha tratado detenidamente Ravasi, *Giobbe*, 185-255, obra que Hartley al parecer desconoce y que le puede resultar muy interesante. En las págs. 21-25, al discutir el tema del prólogo y epílogo, echo de menos las opiniones de Batten, Fine, Brandwein, MacDonald, Fullerton, Van Hoonacker y Hoffman (aunque a éste lo cita en la bibliografía). Falta también, y esto me parece más importante, un estudio de la división del bloque poético, dando por supuesto que el c. 3 no forma parte de las series de discursos, que el primer ciclo termina en el c. 14, etc. Aunque esta opinión coincide con la de numerosos comentaristas, no es tan obvia como puede parecer. Me remito a L. Alonso Schökel y J. L. Sicre, *Job*, 43-46. Por último, tampoco encuentro nada sobre el género literario del libro (salvo rápidas referencias a las teorías de Richter y Westermann). Esto resulta extraño, porque Hartley concede gran importancia al género literario de las distintas unidades. Igual debería haber hecho con el conjunto del libro, ya que se lo ha encuadrado en los apartados más diversos (epopeya, poema didáctico, diálogo/debate, debate judicial, drama). Quizá Hartley se incline a pensar, sin decirlo, que el libro es una obra inclasificable dentro de un género concreto.

En cuanto a la bibliografía, aunque es abundantísima, parece que el autor no ha usado a los comentaristas antiguos (donde habría encontrado un enorme filón), ni tampoco mucho a los de la primera mitad de este siglo, y que desconoce las publicaciones en italiano y español. Concretamente, echo de menos los nombres de Gese, Jastrow, Ravasi, Lods, Couroyer, y está desplazado el de Alonso Schökel (que aparece por Schökel, pero sin citar ninguno de sus dos comentarios). En ciertos momentos, esta ausencia de estudios importantes o significativos llama poderosamente la atención. Me limito a un ejemplo: 42,6, texto capital por contener la respuesta última del protagonista, lo traduce Hartley como es habitual: «Therefore I abase myself and recant in dust and ashes». Me parece la más válida. Pero es extraño que no discuta las opiniones tan opuestas de De Boer en *NedTTs* 31 (1977) 181-194, que niega que Job se convierta, y de Curtis, que traduce: «Therefore I feel loathing contempt and revulsion [toward you, O God]; and I am sorry for frail man». Lo más grave es que a Curtis lo cita, pero sin indicar que piensa todo lo contrario. Dada la importancia del tema debería haber hecho también referencia al estudio de A. de Wilde en *NedTTs* 32 (1978) 265-269, que supone una vuelta a la interpretación tradicional, defendida por Hartley. Pero no deseo causar al lector la impresión de que éste cita a la ligera o de que usa poca información. La impresión que produce la obra es todo lo contrario, y no debe extrañarnos que a veces se pasen por alto incluso estudios de interés.

Tras la introducción encontramos el comentario propiamente dicho. Sigue un esquema fijo, que podemos describir de la siguiente manera. Antes de comentar cada pasaje, ofrece una introducción global al mismo, indicando sus principales partes, género literario y contenido. Lo hace de forma clara y con-

cisa, ayudando al lector a penetrar en el texto. Sigue la traducción, que intenta ser lo más fiel posible al texto hebreo, sin lanzarse a correcciones o reconstrucciones hipotéticas. Es una actitud digna de todo elogio; afortunadamente, están lejos los tiempos en que cada cual escribía su propia Biblia. Por lo demás, la traducción está justificada con abundantes notas y una discusión filológica detallada. Pasa luego al comentario verso a verso, y termina con un resumen centrado en los aspectos teológicos ya que, como indica Hartley desde el principio, su intención es interpretar cada pasaje en relación con el conjunto del mensaje teológico de la obra. Esto da a la exposición una gran claridad y ayuda al lector a recoger las principales ideas en cada momento del libro.

Quizá este afán pedagógico, una mentalidad muy analítica, y una atención excesiva a los géneros literarios que integran las distintas unidades, impulsa al autor a ofrecernos el texto «a pedacitos», impidiendo captar la fuerza literaria del conjunto de las intervenciones. Por ejemplo, el impresionante discurso de Job en los cc. 12-14 lo subdivide en doce unidades, que va traduciendo y comentando poco a poco. Comprendo que es cuestión de gusto y de pedagogía. Pero prefiero perderme en la tormenta intelectual de Job a verme envuelto en suaves olas de seis o siete versos. En el fondo, como indicaba al comienzo, cualquier enfoque que se dé a un comentario de Job corre inevitables riesgos.

En resumen, Hartley ha prestado un buen servicio al amplio público al que se dirige. Encontrará en este libro, sobre todo, claridad en la exposición y una información abundantísima (aunque no exhaustiva, cosa de la que no puede presumir ningún comentario), tras la que se entrevén años de esfuerzo y dedicación. Puede echar de menos cierta pasión; que el comentarista, como Dios a Job, le hable «desde la tormenta». Pero este libro le será una buena obra de consulta, que es a lo único a que puede aspirar un comentario.

Facultad de Teología
E-18080 Granada
España

José L. SICRE

Novum Testamentum

B. ORCHARD-H. RILEY, *The Order of the Synoptics. Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Leuven, Peeters - Macon, Mercer University Press, 1987. XIV-279 p. 23,5 x 16.

In some ways this book is one of the more ambitious to appear from the emerging group of Neo-Griesbachians. Eschewing extensive dialogue with the representatives of other points of view, Riley and Orchard have taken on two of the most important questions in any hypothetical reconstruction of the history of the formation of the Gospels: the basic composition technique (Riley), and what is the patristic testimony pertaining to order of composition of

the Gospels (Orchard). In each case, their work has gone far beyond what is currently available in print.

As to genre, this book is to be compared to F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh 1906), B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London 1924) and, more recently, W. R. Farmer, *Jesus and the Gospel: Tradition, Scripture, and Canon* (Philadelphia 1982). Each of these represents an attempt to trace the history of the rise of the earliest Gospel tradition, how it came to be recorded in many different written forms, what was the early fate of those many gospels, and how the four we have now finally came to be deposited in the New Testament. This is the genre to which *The Order of the Synoptics* belongs. To be sure, Burkitt and Streeter also included in their histories a discussion of the history of the Gospel text, something missing in the histories of Farmer and of Orchard/Riley, indeed, of the Neo-Griesbachian writings generally.

Riley's half of the book focuses squarely on phenomena of order in the Synoptic Gospels. Griesbachians have always said that it is the phenomenon of order of pericopes that provides them with the starting point and best evidence for their hypothesis. Thus considered, it is difficult to see why Riley gives, on pp. 4-6, a synoptic chart that has more in common with Aland's arrangement of parallels and size of pericopes than with Griesbach's original *Commentatio* (see B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff, eds., *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-critical Studies 1776-1976* [SNTS MS 34] 108ff.), or with W. R. Farmer's theoretical reconstructions in "Notes for a History of the Redaction of Synoptic Tradition in Mark", *The Synoptic Problem*, 233-283, or, inexplicably, with Orchard's own "Comparative Structural Analysis" (see either synopsis by Orchard or the table in his *Matthew, Luke and Mark*, 144-163).

Riley's contribution is quite original in one important respect. Riley's is the only book in the entire literature that sets out to test two major hypotheses simultaneously on this fundamental question of the order of pericopes: the Two Document Hypothesis and the Two Gospel Hypothesis (Griesbach Hypothesis). Thus he has written three pairs of discussions: can we understand the order of pericopes in Mark better on the Two Document Hypothesis or the Two Gospel Hypothesis? Then he undertakes the same kind of test of the two hypotheses on the Gospel of Matthew: which theory explains Matthew's order the best? After doing the same for Luke, he concludes with some parting shots at key arguments advanced by certain Markan priorists in a series of Appendices.

Riley bases his entire discussion on an assertion that has never yet been refuted to my knowledge: "at every point where Matthew ceases to follow Mark's order, whether for a short or longer period, Luke continues in it; and wherever Luke ceases to follow Mark's order, Matthew in his turn continues in it" (p. 7; cp. p. 10f.). It is fundamental to observe the only two conclusions that can be drawn from this observation of the literary data: (a) either Mark was written first and then Matthew and Luke agreed to do this, which is absurd (and ruled out by the Two Document Hypothesis) or (b) Mark was written last and used one and then the other successively, thus producing this

alternating support between Matthew and Luke respectively. All who think that this statement also supports the bland conclusion that "Mark is merely the middle term" between Matthew and Luke (e.g., Neirynck and Tuckett) are totally mistaken in a fundamental point of logic. Riley has an interesting suggestion at this point, namely, it looks as if Mark simply rolled forward through two scrolls as he composed his Gospel (pp. 11f.).

On the negative side, Riley's comparisons of the orders of Matthew, Mark and Luke seems constantly to be uninformed by any awareness of their theological or narrative agendas. His discussion of the order of Matthew as being influenced by his Old Testament quotations comes the closest to such a discussion in this entire part of the book. But if all one does is to say, "Mark drew this pericope from Matthew, but then got that pericope from Luke" (such as is also the case with Farmer's "Notes for a History of the Redaction of Synoptic Tradition in Mark", *The Synoptic Problem*, 233-283) there is *nothing explanatory* in such statements. They are all really little more than a whole series of deductive assertions from the basic hypothesis, which states that Mark got his pericopes from Matthew and Luke respectively. Much more useful and interesting would have been a theological and narrative/structural analysis that explained *why* Mark made use of his sources the way(s) he did.

Dom Bernard Orchard breaks considerable new ground in his half of the book. There has never been, to my knowledge, this sort of exhaustive analysis of all relevant patristic evidence bearing on the question of the *order of composition of the Gospels*. A small start had already been made by Prof. Giuseppe G. Gamba, "A Further Reexamination of Evidence from the Early Tradition", *New Synoptic Studies* (ed. W. R. Farmer) (Macon 1983) 17-36.

There are several unusual features to Orchard's discussion. First of all, he takes the "patristic" period to start with the Apostle Paul. As long as Matthew is dated to the 80's by Two Document theorists there can be no question of Paul's use of Matthew. But this theory has been supplanted by Orchard by the view that Matthew was written first, at a very early date, around 40 (p. 236), and from that time onward exerted an enormous influence throughout the church. Orchard makes telling use of the massive research of E. Massaux at this point. But by beginning with Paul (and a redating for Matthew) Orchard is able to reveal in a methodical, step by step analysis of the patristic writings, the evidence for a consistent, traditional position maintained by the leaders of the orthodox Church *from the beginning* down to the fourth and fifth centuries regarding the order of composition of the Gospels: Matthew, Luke, Mark, John. To be sure, Orchard has an unblushing "you-are-there" style of vivid historical imagination (see esp. pp. 266f.) that owes a lot to his teacher at Downside, Dom Gregory Chapman (*Matthew, Mark, and Luke* [London 1937]). While at times one wonders how much of this is little more than a *horror vacui*, in all fairness I must say that Orchard has succeeded in making a convincing case with respect to his early dating of the Gospels (pp. 229ff., 239ff.). I think he is correct in saying that, as long as New Testament scholars persist in dating the writing of the Gospels in the 70's and 80's,

they will never understand anything about the rise and development of the early Church.

Another remarkable suggestion is Orchard's idea that Mark was not meant to be a Gospel like Matthew or Luke at all. His theory is that our Mark was the result of some public lectures given by Peter to demonstrate the close bond in order and content between Luke and Matthew, despite their great differences (p. 272f.). The result, suggests Orchard, is our Gospel of Mark which should be viewed as an "enabling document for Luke's Gospel to take its place as the second authentic witness to Jesus in the churches of Peter and Paul" (p. 279, cf. 264f.). Our ongoing scholarship within the Neo-Griesbachian School tends to support fully this hypothesis.

Orchard's re-examination of the patristic evidence required him to deal at considerable length with the vexed question of the proper understanding of the Papias fragments. Without concurring in all of his suggestions, I would say that I think we owe Orchard (with the important assistance of J. Kürzinger, "Das Papiaszeugnis und die Erstgestalt des Matthäus Evangeliums", *BZ* 4 [1960] 19-38) a debt of gratitude for in large measure successfully unraveling a very complex story, particularly the interesting suggestion that Papias' phrase *Ἐβραϊδι διαλεκτῶ* was originally misunderstood by Irenaeus to mean "in the Hebrew language" which mistake was then repeated by Origen, Eusebius, et al. This removes a major problem, namely, the fact that there is no physical evidence that Matthew ever existed in Hebrew.

Orchard's brief discussion of the ravages of Enlightenment scepticism (p. 111f.) would have benefited from use of the magisterial study carried out on the same subject by theologian and New Testament historian Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London 1979). This much should be noted: these studies by Orchard and Riley and Meyer and many others are part of a trend that is spreading across western biblical scholarship: a trend that is carrying out a fundamental critique of all outmoded and obsolete Enlightenment scepticism with its vaunted "assured results". This new scholarship is marked by a deep reading of the Enlightenment's contribution to biblical research as well as a positive appreciation of the Church's ancient traditions.

University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996 U.S.A.

David L. DUNGAN

Bas VAN IERSEL, *Reading Mark*. Translated from the Dutch by W. H. Bisscheroux [*Belichting Van Het Bijbelboek: Marcus*. Boxtel, Katholieke Bijbelstichting, 1986]. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. 261 p. 13,9 × 21,2. £ 9.95.

Reading Mark is one of those titles which say more than they seem to at first glance. Van Iersel wants to put distance between his approach to Mark and that of the traditional exegete who progresses through the gospel verse by

verse, pericope by pericope, in a kind of scholarly trench warfare. "Not the beads but the necklace" is the phrase van Iersel uses to describe his method of looking at Mark as a whole. And he succeeds in showing that his approach to reading Mark as one conventionally reads a story does indeed offer a way to look at problems which conventional exegesis hasn't coped with adequately.

The book is divided into twelve chapters; the first two serve as introductions and the final ten as commentaries on the text. Van Iersel holds that the original text ends at 16,8, but adds an analysis of 16,9-20 to show how the author(s) of the longer and shorter endings read the gospel. The basis for the divisions of chapters 3-11 is the division which van Iersel adopts for the text. At the end the translation of the New English Bible is reproduced, touched up here and there by the author. Unfortunately and inexplicably the author's divisions are not introduced into the translation and the result is confusion where clarification would have been possible. An index of Scripture texts rounds out the book.

Van Iersel's division of the gospel is as follows (p. 20):

Title (1,1)

- (A1) **In the desert** (1,2-13)
 - (y1) first hinge 1,14-15
- (B1) **In Galilee** (1,16 - 8,21)
 - (z1) blindness sight (8,22-26)
- (C) **On the way** (8,27 - 10,45)
 - (z2) blindness sight (10,46-52)
- (B2) **To Jerusalem** (11,1 - 15,39)
 - (y2) second hinge (15,40-41)
- (A2) **At the tomb** (15,42 - 16,8).

Further subdivisions are mentioned elsewhere (cf. p. 25). The outline is certainly suggestive. It isolates, for example, elements which can serve as symbolic counterparts. And the double healing from blindness is neatly accounted for. Much more work needs to be done if the division is to be convincing, however. But in *Reading Mark* van Iersel has used the type of genre for his comments in which a convincing elaboration can be developed if the text is inherently capable of yielding it.

More convincing at first reading is the way van Iersel succeeds in throwing light on apparently disparate themes as indicated by his discussion of the following terms (p. 195):

<i>field</i>			<i>vineyard</i>
<i>wheat</i>			<i>grapes</i>
<i>bread</i>	BODY	BLOOD	<i>wine</i>
<i>take</i>			<i>take</i>
<i>break</i>	MURDERED	SHED	<i>pour out</i>
<i>give</i>			<i>give</i>
<i>eat</i>			<i>drink.</i>

Here van Iersel plausibly ties together material involving Mark's discussion of the parable of sowing, the discussion about loaves, and the parable of the vineyard. All this is tied in with the "secret" of 4,11, "given" to the twelve and to others not in the sense of giving an explanation but in the sense of giving a challenge. The explanation is to be worked out in the course of the gospel by the disciples; van Iersel's symmetric arrangement of the terms serve as a "code" for seeing what the explanation is: Jesus' identity is connected with the bread and wine of the supper. (Van Iersel, inexplicably, hesitates to regard the account of the supper as concerning a permanent institution—cf. pp. 194 and 110. It would seem possible to allow Mark his own point of view without adopting an interpretation which sunders him altogether from the context of the early Church.)

Van Iersel recognizes the relevance of the sacrifice of Isaac for Jesus' death with regard to time and place (p. 173). He would do well to deepen the thematic relevance of Gen 22 for the gospel by viewing the phrase "beloved son" as an allusion to Isaac at 1,11; 9,7 and 12,6 (cf. R. Le Déaut, "La présentation targumique du sacrifice d'Isaac et la sotériologie paulinienne", *Studiorum paulinorum congressus internationalis catholicus*, 1961 [AnBib 18; Rome 1963] vol. II, 570). Van Iersel recognizes the link between 1,11 and 9,7 (cf. p. 189), but fails to see the link between these two texts and 12,6. The latter link is crucial for it helps pave the way for interpreting Jesus' "cry of dereliction" (15,34) as a disguised cry of victory: Jesus remains God's beloved son even in death; the point of the cry is that it introduces the triumphant conclusion of Ps 22 into the heart of the Passion. (A weakness in van Iersel's treatment of the Passion is his insufficient recognition of the role of irony.)

What emerges from *Reading Mark* is the beginning of a powerful presentation of the identity of Jesus in terms connected with liturgical observance of a son who is destined to suffer and die. But Jesus also gives witness to himself (cf. *Bib* 66 [1985] 126-130). The failure of the disciples which van Iersel's genre of "reading Mark" highlights (cf. pp. 200-201) points to Jesus alone as the originator of Mark's message—the disciples are not to be thought of as devising a scheme in which they figure only to fail. And the women's failure to hand on what had been told them unofficially (one young man at an empty tomb) could hardly be made more obvious.

Van Iersel is on to something, and on to something with implications for understanding not only Mark but the other gospels as well. He deserves a hearing, and his Mark, a reading. Macroexegesis has now formally entered the Biblical scene.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome, Italy

James SWETNAM, S.J.

Roland MEYNET, *L'Évangile selon saint Luc*. Analyse rhétorique (Vol. 1: planches; vol. 2: commentaire). Paris, Le Cerf, 1988. 258 p.; 277 p. 20,8 x 27. 350 FF les deux volumes.

Meynet's two volumes provide a commentary on Luke, but not of the usual type. His work is neither concerned with the historical Jesus nor the history of pre-Lukan traditions nor the historical situation of the Lukan community. Meynet offers a rhetorical analysis of Luke in its finished form. He studies a passage in three stages, discussing its composition, noting connections with other parts of Scripture (a step sometimes omitted), and commenting on the religious significance of selected aspects of the text. The first volume consists of charts; the sections on composition in volume two discuss these charts.

The uniqueness of Meynet's approach appears in the sections on composition, which are fundamental to his work. Meynet believes that parallelism and concentricity (a chiasmic composition with a central element) are the basic figures of biblical rhetoric (2:260), and his discussion of the composition of Luke focuses almost entirely on them, especially on concentricity. Meynet finds concentricity to be the dominant compositional form in Luke. This conviction governs Meynet's procedure in his commentary. He divides Luke into 158 passages, 28 sequences of passages, and four sections (2:247). He typically studies a sequence by commenting on the first passage, then on the symmetrical passage at the end of the sequence, then on other symmetrical pairs, and finally on the central passage. (Thus a sequence of A B C B' A' is studied in the order A A' B B' C.) In many cases both the passages and the sequence of which they are a part are judged to be concentric. After the sequence is studied passage by passage (in this unusual order), Meynet comments on the sequence as a whole, and later on a section as a whole, when a section break is reached.

Meynet's detailed study of the composition of Luke must be the result of intensive work over a considerable period of time. According to Meynet, Luke's manner of composition by parallelism and concentricity closely resembles the Old Testament (2:265). He also finds frequent allusions to the Old Testament in Luke and discusses them in sections on "références interscripturaires" (the second stage of study noted above). The comments in the sections of "interpretation" frequently relate in some way to the preceding sections on composition and scriptural references. The interpretive comments, however, are fragmentary. They do not attempt to present the significance of a passage as a literary whole. They also inject non-Lukan themes. Meynet is presenting a particular type of biblical theology rather than a specifically Lukan theology in these sections.

The rest of this review will concentrate on the composition of Luke, for Meynet's views on this topic raise some interesting methodological issues. I share Meynet's conviction that a rhetorical analysis of biblical literature can have great value, but I differ in my understanding of how this should be done. Meynet's definition of rhetoric appears to be broad ("l'ensemble des lois qui régissent la composition du discours à tous les niveaux de son organi-

sation", 2:10), but his practice is much narrower. Recent discussion of rhetorical criticism of the Bible, especially in North America, could lead to a broader understanding of the task. Wilhelm Wuellner, for instance, in a recent article on "Where is Rhetorical Criticism Taking Us?" (*CBQ* 49 [1987] 448-463), refers to the tendency to identify rhetoric with stylistics and rhetorical criticism with literary criticism but argues that rhetorical criticism should go further by interpreting a literary structure as a strategy in social interaction. He adds, "Rhetorical criticism makes us more fully aware of the *whole* range of appeals embraced and provoked by rhetoric: not only the rational and cognitive dimensions, but also the emotive and imaginative ones" (461). Meynet's work falls short when viewed from this perspective, on two counts: (1) he uses a very limited repertoire of figures, concentrating almost entirely on parallelism and concentricism, and (2) in spite of his comments under the heading of "interpretation", he does not show how the rhetorically structured passages, as wholes, can function as strategic moves—or appeals—in social interaction.

Even if one is convinced that rhetorical criticism is a broader task than Meynet supposes, one can still profit from his study of concentricism in Luke. Nevertheless, caution is required, for Meynet applies concentricism very broadly and thereby hinders the recognition of other rhetorical figures that are sometimes present. When almost everything must fit a concentric pattern, there is little room for recognizing patterns of climax and end stress, for instance. Does Meynet's concern with symmetry of parts in a concentric structure, with a center position that is somehow "privileged" (2:261), reveal the most important rhetorical structures operative in Luke? No general answer can be given, but I will share my reaction to Meynet's analysis of selected passages.

On the one hand, Meynet's analysis of concentricism does sometimes reveal patterns of similarity that are usually ignored. This is true of his discussion of Luke 12,4-12 in comparison with 12,22-34 (2:144, and see the chart on 1:126). The occurrence of "do not fear" and "do not be anxious" in both passages, as well as the repeated assertion that "you are of more value", shows some sort of connection between these passages. Meynet also points out (2:187; charts 1:177-178) an interesting connection between the healing of the blind man near Jericho (18,35-43) and the entry into Jerusalem, with the objection of the Pharisees (19,37-40), in part because they focus on Jesus as son of David or king. Meynet understands the immediate context of a passage to be the passage that balances it in the concentric construction (2:263).

On the other hand, Meynet's fascination with concentricisms prevents him from giving due attention to other rhetorical constructions. Meynet believes that the center of a concentricism is a "privileged" position, like the keystone of an arch (2:261). Frequently, his own interpretive comments fail to support this, however, for he does not use the central element as a key to the whole. This would be difficult to do consistently. It would, in fact, place the emphasis in the wrong place, in many cases.

For instance, Meynet indicates that 11,17 is the center of a concentricism in 11,14-20 (2:135-136). But 11,17 prepares for 18, which clearly receives

the emphasis because it provides the response relevant to the preceding charge (11,15). Meynet's concentrisms sometimes replace more natural rhetorical patterns, such as a series of similar elements, sometimes with end stress. To be sure, the patterns do not always conflict. In the parable of the minas (19,12-27) there is sufficient material after the master begins to address the third servant for Meynet to place the center at the beginning of this address (19,22a; cf. 1:181). The rhetorical pattern (a series of three with final contrast) does build toward this third confrontation, although I doubt that it is legitimate to designate the first sentence of the master's reply, in particular, as central. In other cases, such as the temptations in 4,1-13, Meynet turns a parallelism of three elements into a concentricism (2:49-50; chart 1:37). It is true that in some respects the first and third dialogue with the devil are closest in expression, but in other respects the second and third resemble each other. The third, in fact, combines features of the first and second. There is little justification for saying that the first and third are similar and the second distinct. A second discussion of the parable of the banquet (14,15-24) in Meynet's conclusion shows that he is somewhat aware of the problem he faces in trying to make a distinctive center out of what is actually a member of a series (in this case, the response of the third invited guest; cf. 2:256). The argument that he presents does not convince me.

Meynet sometimes notes verbal themes that occur outside the symmetrical patterns of his concentrisms. This should be done more freely, for the similarities that he notes between symmetrical passages may not be found in them alone. For instance, the themes connecting the Benedictus and the annunciation to the shepherds (cf. Meynet, 2:53) actually occur more generally in Luke 1,5-3,6 (cf. R. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* [Philadelphia 1986] 1:42-43).

Meynet's emphasis on concentricism and his treatment of the texts out of their narrative order do not encourage an understanding of Luke as a developing narrative. Parallelism and concentricism are patterns that are most highly developed in poetry. Although they may occur in narrative, they are not an adequate basis for rhetorical analysis of a narrative like Luke-Acts. An understanding of *narrative* rhetoric is required (on this term see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:8). The Old Testament, obviously important in Meynet's thinking about Luke, can be a significant help, for recent scholars, such as R. Alter (*The Art of Biblical Narrative* [New York 1981]) and M. Sternberg (*The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* [Bloomington 1985]) have discussed narratives of the Hebrew Bible in ways that are illuminating for Luke-Acts.

A brief illustration may suggest some of the concerns of narrative rhetoric. Meynet rightly notes that the story of Zacchaeus (Luke 19,1-10) involves reciprocal seeking on the part of Zacchaeus and Jesus (2:184). In the Lukan narrative Jesus is a reliable character, in the sense that he reliably represents the beliefs and values that the narrator wishes to affirm. What he seeks has positive value within the Lukan narrative world, and to seek him is also a positive value. The developing narrative scene suggests things that contribute to these valued goals and things that are obstacles. Especially, the scene is rhetorically shaped to highlight the crowd as an obstacle and to reply to the crowd when it resists. It is an appeal to those who share the crowd's

attitude, challenging them to view Zacchaeus and Jesus' mission in new ways. If this is true, we should find that each part of the scene contributes to this rhetorical goal.

Rhetorical criticism is a sophisticated way of listening to the message of the text; hence its importance. Consequently, questions of how to implement this method are also important. I have emphasized the methodological differences between myself and Meynet in hope that my remarks may provoke further thought in others interested in rhetorical criticism. I respect the great care and diligence with which Meynet has developed his own perspective, but I believe that rhetorical criticism must be more broadly conceived.

Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Delaware, Ohio 43015
U.S.A.

Robert C. TANNEHILL

Mathias RISSI, *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefts*. Ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 41). Tübingen, J. B. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987. x-140 p. 24 × 15,5. DM 58,—.

Après une étude de la situation qui a provoqué la rédaction de l'épître aux Hébreux, cet ouvrage présente un rapide survol des principaux thèmes de la théologie de l'auteur: l'image qu'elle donne de Dieu, ce qu'elle dit du monde céleste, de la christologie, des effets de l'œuvre du salut, de l'Eglise et de l'eschatologie. Chacun des chapitres est divisé en brèves sections, qui ne peuvent, évidemment, que donner une idée sommaire de la problématique. Pareille concision étonne. Elle n'est pas due aux limites imposées par la collection, car celle-ci comprend des volumes de plus de 500 pages. Pour traiter dignement de la théologie de l'épître aux Hébreux, 140 pages peuvent difficilement suffire.

Elles permettent cependant de donner des aperçus intéressants et d'ouvrir des perspectives, ce que M.R. ne manque pas de faire. Comme l'annonce le sous-titre, l'ouvrage s'efforce de rendre compte de la théologie de l'épître en partant de «la situation de l'auteur et de ses lecteurs». M.R. conçoit cette situation d'une façon nouvelle: au lieu de présenter les destinataires comme des chrétiens qui ont perdu leur ferveur initiale, il les voit comme des charismatiques exaltés, qui oublient la croix du Christ et les exigences réelles de la foi chrétienne. C'est là une hypothèse de travail originale et suggestive. Le problème est de lui donner consistance. On peut assurément trouver dans l'épître quelques allusions à des expériences charismatiques, par exemple en He 6,4-5 (pp. 5-7), mais il faut remarquer que ce passage s'applique aux nouveaux convertis en général, — et non pas aux seuls destinataires de l'épître, — et que, d'autre part, les expériences charismatiques y sont présentées sous

un jour entièrement positif, sans la moindre mise en garde contre d'éventuels excès.

L'auteur de l'épître estimait-il que les destinataires se trouvaient «dans une grave crise» (p. 1)? Un passage comme He 6,4-8 peut en donner l'impression, mais il suffit de lire la phrase suivante de l'épître pour se détromper. L'auteur, en effet, y affirme clairement sa conviction que ceux à qui il s'adresse se trouvent «du bon côté, celui du salut» (6,9; trad. *TOB*). On voit, à cet exemple, combien il est risqué, méthodologiquement, de se servir d'exhortations adressées à un public pour définir la situation de ce public. Lorsqu'un prédicateur met en garde ses auditeurs contre les péchés mortels, peut-on en déduire que ceux-ci sont tous, ou presque tous, sur le point d'en commettre?

Un autre aspect de l'étude menée par M.R. consiste à rechercher, dans le texte de l'épître, les matériaux qui pourraient provenir d'une tradition antérieure et, en particulier, de la tradition reçue par les destinataires. Comme l'auteur de l'épître ne donne jamais d'indication explicite à ce sujet, on s'aventure de nouveau ici dans les sables mouvants des conjectures. M.R. y manifeste plus d'une fois une hardiesse intrépide. Le cas le plus impressionnant concerne les ch. 8-10. Selon M.R., «dans le ch. 8 l'auteur met ensemble tout ce que les destinataires tiennent en haute estime, pour soumettre cela, dans les ch. 9-10, à une réflexion critique et à des modifications» (p. 56). Cette division n'a aucun fondement réel dans le texte et s'appuie sur des analyses fort contestables. Comme premier point important, M.R. soutient que «le culte céleste, au ch. 8, est dépourvu de tout lien avec l'idée de sacrifice» (p. 57). Il fonde cette opinion sur la phrase d'He 8,3b, où il voit un verbe à l'imparfait, auquel, en recourant à la grammaire de Debrunner, il attribue le sens d'un irréel (p. 57 et n. 35). Le malheur est que ce verbe à l'imparfait n'existe pas, à cet endroit, dans le texte grec de l'épître, qui a une phrase nominale. L'interprétation proposée par M.R. y est impossible.

Une autre discussion (p. 38) malmène, elle aussi, le texte grec. M.R. y affirme qu'en He 9,24, «il est dit du grand prêtre céleste *eisēlthen hagia*». C'est mettre le lecteur en pleine confusion. Pour n'être pas infidèle et incompréhensible, la citation devrait comporter au moins deux autres mots du texte: la négation *ou* et la préposition *eis*. En effet, ce qui est dit du Christ en He 9,24 c'est qu'il «*n'est pas entré dans un sanctuaire fabriqué... mais dans le ciel même*». Toute la discussion de ce texte est faussée par l'erreur de la citation. Contrairement à ce que prétend M.R., l'absence d'article devant *hagia* ne fait pas problème en He 9,24, car elle est commandée par la négation, que M.R. oublie de citer. L'auteur doit omettre l'article, car il veut exclure tout sanctuaire fabriqué. Dire qu'en He 9,24, à cause de l'absence de l'article, *hagia* désigne l'ensemble du sanctuaire comme *tēs... skēnēs* en 9,11 (p. 39), c'est commettre une double erreur, car ni l'un ni l'autre de ces termes ne désigne, dans les phrases citées, l'ensemble du sanctuaire. En He 9,24 comme en He 9,12 *hagia*, précédé de la préposition *eis*, désigne le lieu où doit aboutir le culte, tandis que *skēnēs* en 9,11, précédé de la préposition *dia*, désigne le lieu par où l'on passe. Ces deux lieux sont deux parties différentes de l'ensemble du sanctuaire.

Au sujet de la «tente plus grande et plus parfaite», question fort controversée mais de grande importance pour la christologie de l'épître, M.R. ne donne même pas une vue d'ensemble de la problématique. Il faut en dire autant du problème de la *teleiōsis* du Christ, auquel il ne consacre qu'une page (p. 79).

Bref, après la lecture de ce volume, le lecteur restera sur sa faim. Il pourra cependant estimer qu'il n'a pas perdu son temps, car il aura remarqué bien des observations valables et plus d'une mise au point judicieuse et il se sentira stimulé à prolonger la recherche pour vérifier nombre d'affirmations problématiques.

Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

Albert VANHOYE S.J.

Varia

Les lettres d'el-Amarna. Correspondance diplomatique du pharaon. Traduction de William L. MORAN avec la collaboration de V. Haas et G. Wilhelm. Traduction française de Dominique Collon et Henri Cazelles. (Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 13). Paris, Le Cerf, 1987. 630 p. 19,5 × 12,5. 290 FF.

The year 1987 was an appropriate time for this new translation to appear. It marked the 100th anniversary of the discovery of the Amarna tablets. William L. Moran has crowned his career as the unquestioned dean of Amarna studies by this monumental achievement, a fresh collation and translation of all the letters in the Amarna archive (the literary and school texts are not treated in this present work). He has been working on this project for nearly twenty years but his own first publication on the subject of an Amarna letter appeared forty years ago, a joint article with W. F. Albright, "A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2 (1948) 239-248.

Moran's personal odyssey for this present publication began in the 1970's and took him to the various museums to which the scattered letters had made their way, especially London, Berlin, Paris and Cairo. During the intervening years, he has shared the results of those personal collations with the small circle of Amarna devotees, this reviewer included. Knowing that Moran's new translation would incorporate the fruits his firsthand insights, we have waited impatiently for this book. Our hopes have not been disappointed.

The brief introduction of forty-four pages condenses the main information needed by the interested reader, both the experienced scholar and the newcomer. The customary philological and historical aspects of the discovery and publication are given followed by a discussion of the language and the writing (palaeography and orthography). The notes and collations made

by the late Edmund Gordon had also been placed at Moran's disposal and he frequently refers to them in his notes. The script and the dialects of the various letters are analyzed as only Moran could do it. Our observations, like his, will be restricted to points of general interest, avoiding specific linguistic details. Those seeking basic bibliographical references will find them in Moran's copious but not exaggerated footnotes (in the introduction and throughout the translations).

A few letters hail from Cassite Babylonia itself, and are a precious addition to the limited corpus of Middle Babylonian letters. One text (EA 15) is in the Assyrian dialect; another (EA 24) is in Hurrian and two (EA 31-32) are in Hittite.

Broadly speaking, all the other letters are in the provincial dialects known as "Peripheral Akkadian". Within that "peripheral" sphere, which encompasses most of the Fertile Crescent from the Tigris to Anatolia and down across the Levant to Egypt (plus Alashia = Cyprus), two language traditions are distinguishable. Some letters were written from the capital of the Mitannian empire; a number of others were written in cities of North Syria that were vassal states within that empire. All these "Mitannian" epistles share the linguistic affinities of the archives from Nuzi and Alalakh IV (both of which date to the fifteenth century BC). There is a strong Hurrian influence throughout, especially in the orthography, phonetics and syntax. Since the Mitannian empire encompassed Assyria, one is not surprised to find a modicum of Assyrian linguistic influence, but much less than might have been surmised on historical grounds. The fact is, however, that this "Hurrianized" Akkadian is clearly a branch off from Babylonian, even down to some of the principal characteristics of Middle Babylonian. When we remember that Mitanni arose in Southern Turkey and Northern Syria, just where the Middle Bronze Age "Amurrite" kingdoms had flourished, it is surprising that the Mitannian scribes did not reflect more of the Northern Old Babylonian dialect used so extensively by all the city-states in the area, such as Mari and Aleppo (Yamkhad).

However, it is the other, southern dialect (or pidgin as Moran prefers to call it) to which Moran has devoted so much of his research efforts. To be sure, from almost the very beginning, scholars had observed that the texts from the area of the biblical Canaan contained features much more reminiscent of Hebrew and Phoenician. Their efforts at sorting out all these elements were hindered by the then current stage of Assyriological knowledge; the classic outlines of Akkadian grammar had not been firmly established. Furthermore, the precise linguistic definition of the Northwest Semitic dialects (to which Hebrew, Aramaic and Phoenician belong) had not yet been achieved, especially with regard to the *historical* development of ancient Hebrew. Then came W. L. Moran.

Moran's doctoral dissertation (*A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as reflected in the Amarna Tablets* [Johns Hopkins University 1950]) was the real twentieth-century breakthrough in our understanding of the fundamental language in which these southern Amarna letters were written. This "pidgin" dialect was made up largely of Akkadian words, to be sure, but the verbal *inflection* and *syntax* were "Canaanite". There were similarities with

classical Arabic and with biblical Hebrew. It is now clear that there were also numerous isoglosses with the language of Ugarit. There is no similar dialect parallel anywhere in the cuneiform world.

Moran himself has utilized this new knowledge of the Byblos/Canaanite dialect in the Amarna letters to redefine some salient features in the historical development of biblical Hebrew. Some of the "Amarna devotees" mentioned above have also begun to make significant contributions, standing on Moran's giant shoulders, as it were.

Two cities in particular, and an occasional letter from elsewhere, reflect a conscious departure from the "norms" of that "Canaanized" pidgin. Jerusalem and Tyre (also partially Sidon) have produced letters the scribes of which employed a different writing tradition. They did use some Canaanite expressions, but they have more Assyrianisms and other points of contact with the Syrian dialect of the north. Both scribes show some acquaintance with Egyptian literary and religious traditions.

The scribes from Egypt generally write a better form of Middle Babylonian, with only an occasional Egyptianism or West Semitism (cf. Z. Cochavi-Rainey, *The Akkadian Dialect of the Egyptian Scribes in the 14th-13th centuries B.C.E. — Linguistic Analysis* [Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv Univ. 1988] [Hebrew]). On the other hand, the scribes of Amurru (see the historical section below) seem to have their own, unique tradition. The earlier letters, from 'Abdi-Ashirta (written to Amenhotep III), have some "Canaanite" affinities, but the letters of his sons (sent to Amenhotep IV) reflect the new Hittite presence in the area — the scribes had adopted a style much closer to that of the North Syrian "Hurrianized" Akkadian (cf. Sh. Izre'el, *The Akkadian Dialect of the Scribes of Amurru in the 14th-13th Centuries B.C. — Linguistic Analysis* [Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv Univ. 1985] [Hebrew]).

Biblical scholars may be primarily interested in the Amarna Tablets as historical documents. Moran has now placed at their disposal a set of lucid renderings of all the texts and some of the notes are historical in nature as well as linguistic. It is possible to make a reappraisal of the historical events reflected in this most significant archive.

Case histories. First of all, it must be remembered that the tablets of this "archive" are actually discards. Whether or not they had been deposited in dump pits, like the few examples found by Petrie during his excavations at el-Amarna, they represent "files" of documents no longer relevant to the administration of the empire by the Egyptian authorities. When the royal headquarters were being moved away from the city at el-Amarna, during the reign of Tutankhamon, these particular tablets were no longer considered important; they were thrown away, either in dump-pits or left in the abandoned buildings. This has to be kept in mind when evaluating the historical events and their implications.

The Mitanni letters were part of an old file, the correspondence of Amenhotep III with Tushratta, king of Mitanni. A few of the Mitanni texts were then sent to Amenhotep IV shortly after his assumption to the throne. Most or all of these letters, even those to the new king, were originally sent to Thebes, as indicated by an inked hieratic notation made on one of the last

in this series (EA 27). It shows that the letter was received in the second year of Amenhotep IV, that is two years before the ground was laid out for the building of the new capital city of Akhetaton at el-Amarna. During the early years at the new headquarters, Amenhotep IV (now calling himself Akhnaton) received the news that the Mitanni kingdom had been crushed by Suppiluliuma, king of the Hittites. Henceforth, foreign relations in the Levant were concerned with this new force that had occupied the former Mitannian territories and which was threatening Egyptian interests in the area.

Earlier studies of the Amarna tablets had led scholars to think that Akhnaton had neglected his empire because of his religious reforms. Closer examination of the texts reveals that this is not true. Of course, there was undoubtedly a time when the rulership was passing from father (Amenhotep III) to son (Amenhotep IV/Akhnaton) that certain Levantine rulers tried to gain better positions *vis-à-vis* their neighbors to as to present the new pharaoh with a *fait accompli*. These trouble-makers were summarily dealt with and the closed case files eventually discarded.

A case in point is the correspondence concerning the northern Phoenician coast. The backbone of this "file" is the large group of some seventy letters from Rib-Haddi, ruler of Byblos (EA 68-95, 101-138). There are also the few texts from 'Abdi-Ashirta, a freebooter who used 'apiru warriors to subvert local city-rulers so as to create a new territorial state; these were sent to Amenhotep III and were brought to Akhetaton as background material. Rib-Haddi of Byblos complained bitterly of the aggressions by 'Abdi-Ashirta and Amenhotep III responded by sending troops to the area to put a stop to the Amurru rebellion. 'Abdi-Ashirta was disposed of (cf. Moran's translation of EA 101 on pp. 294-295). With regard to one crucial passage in the 'Abdi-Ashirta correspondence, it is possible to take issue with Moran's translation and the historical implications. The text is EA 60:30-32, which Moran interprets as an affirmation in past tense, "That the King 'my' lord verily took thought for me (or acknowledged me) and assigned me to the charge of Pahanate his commissioner". The particular verbal constructions used by the scribe could be past tense affirmations in *good Akkadian* but the normal practice within the corpus of Amurru letters was to use that same construction (as often in the Canaanite style letters) like the Akkadian precativum, i.e. as a forceful jussive: "May the king take thought for (or acknowledge) me and (may he) assign me to the charge of P. his commissioner" (thus Izre'el 1985:5,251). The latter rendering indicates that 'Abdi-Ashirta was *applying for recognition* by Pharaoh by virtue of his deeds in behalf of the Egyptian government. This action may thus be viewed as the culmination of 'Abdi-Ashirta's ambitions: to found a new territorial state (Amurru) and to have himself recognized as its legitimate ruler under Egyptian suzerainty.

After 'Abdi-Ashirta was eliminated from the scene, his sons took up the cudgels as least as soon as Amenhotep III was replaced by his son, Amenhotep IV. Most of the story is gleaned from the further letters of Rib-Haddi. It seems that the sons embarked on a renewed campaign of subversion and aggression against any city-ruler who would not join them. However, this time they appear to have gained the support of some high-ranking official(s) in the Egyptian government. After all, Mitanni had fallen or was already

tottering on the brink and the Hittite Suppiluliuma was threatening Egyptian interests in Syria. It apparently seemed more logical now to encourage the establishment of a territorial buffer state on the northern frontier of Canaan. So 'Abdi-Ashirta's sons, the leader of whom was Aziru, gained support for their plans at the expense of loyal city-rulers like the hapless Rib-Haddi. The latter was eventually driven out of Byblos by his own brother; a period of political asylum in Beirut and an abortive attempt to return to Byblos left Rib-haddi exposed to his enemies who finally managed to have him assassinated.

In southern Canaan, other case files reveal similar incidents. There the most notorious trouble-maker was Lab'ayu of Shechem. He enjoyed an alliance with the rulers of Gezer and Gath-Carmel and he subjugated politically Gath-padalla on the Sharon Plain and took several towns in the Plain of Dothan by force (EA 250). Then he was in a position to threaten Megiddo (EA 244). The Egyptians had just recently called home their regular army unit that was usually stationed at Megiddo (EA 244); one may venture the suggestion that this move was related to Pharaoh's need for huge numbers of loyal troops on hand at home, that is, during his overt move against the great financial institutions of his country, the temples. In order to succeed against the religious/financial sector, Akhnaton needed the support of the military sector. His leading officials all had military rank, and recent researches have shown a surprising affinity between the so-called heretic king and the army. Now, during the period (a year or two) when the standing army was not present, Lab'ayu thought to establish control over the important caravan route from Egypt to Damascus and Babylon via the Sharon and Jezreel Plains. However, the pharaoh's internal conflict with the temple bureaucracies did not hamper the effective administration of the provinces—contrary to the popular notion. The conclusion of the Lab'ayu affair reveals that the Egyptian authorities, including Pharaoh himself, were alert to any threats to the stability of Canaan and that they took appropriate action with alacrity. A warrant was issued for Lab'ayu's arrest. The local city-rulers were charged with carrying it out. That some of them, such as the ruler of Acco and probably others, wanted Lab'ayu dead is obvious from the final result. The culprit was taken from Megiddo to Hannathon on the way to Acco where he was to be sent by sea to Egypt. At Hannathon, the captors took a bribe from Lab'ayu and released him (along with Ba'lu-meher, cf. below). As Lab'ayu made a dash for the mountains of Shechem and safety, the "men of Gina" (probably Jenin but possibly of Megiddo) laid an ambush for him and he was slain. The ruler of Megiddo claimed innocence (EA 245).

These are only some of the exciting chapters of Canaanite history to be gleaned from the Amarna tablets. Concerning one actor in this drama, there is room for disagreement with Moran. The main source for Lab'ayu's nefarious deeds is the report by a certain ruler at Gath-padalla who writes his name ¹⁴IŠKUR.UR.SAG, with the Sumerian signs meaning "The storm god is a warrior (hero)". When Lab'ayu was released from arrest, he was sent home along with someone whose name is written ¹⁴IŠKUR-me-her (EA 245:44). It so happens that this latter name contains the Canaanite epithet **meher/*mahr* which is known in Ugaritic as a term for "warrior". So both

names have identical meaning. Years ago this reviewer proposed to equate the two men, ¹⁴IŠKUR.UR.SAG and ¹⁴IŠKUR-me-her, and to read the Canaanite form as *Ba'lu-meher* (A. F. Rainey, "Gath-padalla", *IEJ* 18 [1968] 1-14). It seems too much of a coincidence that two men having names that mean precisely the same thing should be associated with Lab'ayu in the same political scandal. Moran rejects my suggestion on the basis of arguments posed by N. Na'aman concerning text EA 257. The body of the letter reads:

Behold, I am the 'loyal' servant of the king, and may the king, my lord, be apprised that h[is city] and [hi]s servant are well; [and] now I have placed my neck in the yoke which I must pull, so may the king, my lord, be apprised that I am serving him very diligently, [and that (the city)] x is serving him [very diligently]" (EA 257:6-22).

Moran, following Knudtzon, reads the signs for the partly effaced name of the city as [... i]g-ma-te which suggests no known identification among the geographical names of the Late Bronze Age. However, the alleged 'ig' sign is not at all certain. Moran's own personal collation shows a sign that could easily be 'ti'. The final *te* sign in that line is also very sloppy, written near the edge of the tablet, and contains the same number of wedges as does the sign GAL. So the line could be restored [URUKIN-t]i ma-gal! The resultant translation would then be "[the city of Gat]h, very [diligently]". And this, I submit, is far more commensurate with the evidence, both epigraphic and historical. It places Ba'lu-meher squarely at Gath(-padalla).

A great deal of attention has been given to the meaning of the term 'apîrû (also written ideographically SA.GAZ) applied to certain groups of trouble-makers in the Amarna and earlier period. Moran's translations and also his recent short article on the subject (W. L. Moran, "Join the 'apîru or become one?", *Working with No Data. Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Th. O. Lambdin* [ed. D. M. Golomb] [Winona Lake 1987] 209-212) leave no doubt that the 'apîrû were outlaws, renegades from the established feudal society. Often the term means someone who is in open rebellion against Egyptian authority, whether he is a city-ruler or a stateless bandit. It is certain that the 'apîrû were never tribesmen and never tribalized. They were not landless peasant farmers fleeing their Canaanite feudal masters nor were they bedouin from off the desert. Linguistically, there is no connection whatever between the 'apîrû and the Hebrew ('*ibrim*) nor is there any connection sociologically or historically.

On the other hand, what is known from the Amarna tablets about the social and ethnic situation from the Amarna letters (in spite of inevitable gaps) precludes any assumption that the biblical tribes of Israel were already in the land. That popular belief has no more support in the historical sources today than it did one hundred years ago.

One may confidently say that W. L. Moran's translations represent the *latest* state of the art renderings of the Amarna tablets. This is not to say that they are the *last* word on Amarna interpretation. The broken, sometimes fragmentary, nature of the tablets leaves much room for alternate suggestions. This is especially the case with those lines of text near the top or

bottom edge. And although no living scholar has a better grasp of the Amarna corpus as a whole than does Moran, a great deal can still be done by comparing the use of idioms, syntagmas and verb forms as they appear in all their Amarna contexts. The meaning of an idiomatic phrase or verbal usage may be obvious in some passages and obscure in others. The format of this present review does not permit the text-by-text discussion of such possible corrections. Those will be reserved for another occasion.

Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv P.O.B. 39040
Tel Aviv 69978 Israel

Anson F. RAINEY

E. VERREET, *Modi Ugaritici: Eine morpho-syntaktische Abhandlung über das Modalsystem im Ugaritischen* (OLA 27). Leuven, Peeters, 1988. xxx-264 p. 16,3 × 24,5. 2950 FB.

Verreet's book describes the use of the "moods" in the Ugaritic prefix conjugations traditionally known as the "indicative" *yaqtulu*, the "apocopate" *yaqtul*, the "subjunctive" *yaqtula*, and the "energetic" *yaqtulan(na)*. Before discussing each of them, the author outlines the indications for identifying these forms, namely, verbs III-aleph (this is the clearest indication), verbs III W/Y (this assumes some agreement on diphthong and triphthong contraction rules given on p. 21-33, also *UF* 19 [1987] 342-345), forms without *-na* (2fs, 2pl m and 3pl m/f, which are already a matter of interpretation), and the use of *nun* energeticum. The latter would actually benefit from the result of the study rather than serving as a piece of evidence. The tables of verbal paradigms on p. 31-33, complete with the vocalized forms, are very useful indeed. The reader, however, should keep in mind that the author rejects the existence of internal causative and internal passive.

The picture that emerges from the discussions on *yaqtulu* and *yaqtul* is as follows. Both forms chiefly express the way the speaker presents the events rather than the time when the events take place. Thus they represent categories of aspect rather than those of tense. The form *yaqtulu* basically expresses the durative aspect. Since the form is used to describe durative events that take place during and/or after the time of the utterance, it also takes on a present-future meaning. The form *yaqtul* describes an event that takes place once, hence the punctual aspect. In the majority of such cases, the events related take place in the past and therefore *yaqtul* also assumes a preterite meaning.

The author also specifies the various meanings of *yaqtul*: durative (p. 38-52, with its various shades: stative, iterative, resultative), indicative present (p. 51-53), future (p. 53-57), extra-temporal (p. 57f.), injunctive imperfect (p. 58f.). However, it would be helpful to state the context(s) in which a particular meaning may appear. It is certainly not a mere coincidence that

all examples of the durative are taken from passages which are narrative in character, whereas the other four meanings are from non-narrative texts, namely, addresses, prescriptions, direct speeches (p. 51-60). Hence the discourse type (narrative vs. non-narrative) is likely to be a basic factor in determining the meaning of *yaqtulu*. Such an observation could perhaps give greater precision to the conclusions on *yaqtulu* given on p. 60 and 246.

The distribution over narrative and non-narrative texts can also add control to the description of *yaqtul*. The form is found in the narrative-punctual-preterite sense (p. 61-74) and in the jussive sense (p. 104-109). Yet the data show that the former occurs in narrative texts, whereas the latter in non-narrative ones. This clear distribution makes the the hypothetical contrast in stress (narrative **yáqtul* vs. jussive **yaqtúl*) unnecessary.

The durative *yaqtulu* is often found side by side with *yaqtul* (p. 75-78, note that all examples come from narrative texts). The present reviewer finds that their use goes beyond the mere contrast of durative vs. punctual. A case in point is *KTU* 1.17, I, 1-5 (p. 75 ex. 1): (a) *aphn ġr mt hrnm* 'darauf der Held, der Mann von Hrn' (b) *uzr ilm ylhm* 'isst er das Kraftmittel der Götter' (c) *uzr ilm yšqy bn qdš* 'trinkt er das Kraftmittel der Söhne der Heiligkeit' (d) *yd šth y'l w yškb* 'er warf sein Kleid ab, stieg empor und legte/legte sich nieder' (e) *yd mizrth p yln* 'er warf seinen Ledenschurz ab und verbrachte die Nacht'. Verreet states that in (c) and (b) the verbs represent durative *yaqtulu*, whereas in (d) and (e) punctual *yaqtul*. But is the contrast between durative and punctual really the point here? A larger perspective appears once the narrative thread is taken into consideration. There is a series of sequential events that carries the narrative forward: Danel's throwing away his clothes followed by his going up, then his lying down, and — in the typical repetitive style — his putting away his belt followed by his sleeping through the night. These are obviously the main events or the skeleton of the narration. The eating and drinking, on the other hand, provide a background to the main events. Note that the background does not picture the events as sequential to each other. The use of *yaqtulu-yaqtul* in narrative text is meant to indicate the contrast between background and foreground. The durative and punctual aspects are a consequence of this same movement. Another illustration is *KTU* 1.2, I, 30-31 (p. 76 ex. 2): *aḥr tamġiyāni mlak ym t'dt tpt nhr* 'Nachher kommen die Boten des Yamm an, die Gesandtschaft des Richters-Strom' *l p'n il lā tappulā lā tištahwiya pḥr m'd* 'Zu Füssen des Il fielen sie nicht, sie warfen sich nicht nieder vor der versammelten Schar'. The explanation that *tamġiyāni* is "Dur(ativ) mit resultativischem Nebensinn" in contrast with the punctual *tappulā* and *lā tištahwiya* does not take into account the narrative thread. A couple of lines earlier (lines 21-22) we are told that the gods perceived Yammu's two messengers, who were now arriving, *tamġiyāni* (l. 30, dual *yaqtulu*). With this situation as background, there appears a series of events described in *yaqtul*: the gods lowered (*tagliyū*, l. 23, Verreet's p. 67 ex. 3) their heads. Baal then rebuked them (*yig'ar*, l. 24-28) telling them to raise their heads and thereupon the gods lifted up (*tišša'ū*, p. 66 ex. 2) their heads. Against the same background we are also told that the two messengers did not fall or bow down (*tappulā*, *lā tištahwiya*, p. 76 ex. 3). Hence the use of *yaqtul* in

these lines represents the main sequence of events, whereas the use of *yaqtulu* describes the background.

The above observation may improve on the discussion of the "durative-resultative" sense of *yaqtulu* (p. 46-51). In *KTU* 1.19, II, 9-10 (p. 47 ex. 4, also p. 83 ex. 2), Puġatu's lifting up, *tšu* = *tišša'u*, Danel, her father, onto the back of the ass implies, as Verreet says, that her father now stays on the back of the ass, hence the resultative sense of the verb. The question is, of course: why is the resulting situation meaningful? This will become clear if one sees Puġatu's lifting up her father as background to the series of main events in the next passage (lines 11-13, not considered by Verreet), namely, Danel's approaching and inspecting his neglected land. The case is all the more evident in *KTU* 1.23, 37-38 (pp. 47 and 174): *ydh yšu* (= *yišša'u*), *yr* (= *yar(r)i* < **yar(r)iy*, rather than inf. abs. *yarā*) *šmmh*, *yr b šmm 'sr* 'Raising his hands, he (the god Ilu) shot skyward, he did shoot a bird in the sky' (my translation). The main action is of course the shooting, *yr* (*yaqtul*), whereas the raising of the hands, *yšu* (*yaqtulu*), is the background.

One of Verreet's significant contributions is the observation on the use of *yaqtula* in dependent clauses. Ugaritic rarely uses subordinating conjunctions and prefers *wa-* to connect a dependent clause to a main clause. Often such a connection is not marked with *wa-*, hence the frequent asyndetic construction. This study shows convincingly that *yaqtula* is the form *par excellence* used to mark the dependency of a clause to a preceding one regardless of their semantic category: relative, purpose, result, object, causal, comparative, or temporal clauses. (Conditional sentences are not included in the system since both the protasis and the apodosis are actually independent sentences, p. 210.) It is interesting to note that there is no example of *yaqtul* in a dependent clause. This agrees with the reviewer's observation on the foreground-background contrast given earlier. By definition, dependent clauses cannot be a foreground and therefore *yaqtul* does not occur there. As a corollary, forms that express background are capable of being used in dependent clauses. This fits in with Verreet's data that *yaqtulu*, together with *qatala* (perfect), and *qatālu* (inf. abs.) are also found in dependent clauses. The question now is: how one can explain the variety of verbal forms in dependent clauses? According to Verreet's statistics, the literary and the earlier texts tend to use *yaqtula*, whereas the non-literary and later texts *yaqtulu*, *qatala*, and *qatālu*. Looking at Verreet's data, one will not fail to notice that the examples of *yaqtulu* in dependent clauses are taken from non-narrative passages, as are the forms in *qatala*, and *qatālu*. If such is really the case, then the explanation of the variety of the verbal forms in dependent clauses ought to lie in the narrative and non-narrative character of the texts themselves rather than the literary or non-literary and earlier or later texts. Some passages may appear as counter-examples since they are not presented as narrative. Yet they are also capable of being analyzed differently: rather than a pf, the form *npl* (p. 148 ex. 4) can be a ptc *nāpilu*, likewise *mīlat* (ex. 6) can be a ptc/adj *māli'ati*. Thus they will be examples of appositions and not relative clauses. P. 174 ex. 3 is hardly a final clause with infinitive absolute, but a *yaqtul* describing foreground, as discussed earlier.

In independent clauses the energetic form *yqtl*n is found with all senses of the prefix conjugations *yqtl* (ch. 7, p. 80-98). This being the case, would it not be better to treat *yqtl*n as a variant of any one of the three? Actually the discussions on p. 71-94 describe the environments in which such an energetic variant occurs. By analogy the *qtl*-forms also take the *nun* energeticum, thus *yqtl* : *yqtl*n :: *yqtl*n : X = *qtl*n. The *qtl*n-form may be an energetic imperative, perfect, or infinitive absolute. In dependent clauses, however, *yqtl*n cannot be a variant of *yaqtul* simply because this form does not occur in them.

This work is a fine piece of scholarship. Thanks to Verreet's study we now know more about the syntax of moods and tenses in Ugaritic. The discussions above only demonstrate that the work has really performed its task.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Rome

Agustinus GIANTO

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Célébration du Centenaire (1890-1990) de l'Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem

Le 15 Novembre 1890, l'Ecole Biblique Française, fondée par le Père Lagrange dans le Couvent dominicain Saint-Etienne de Jérusalem, donnait ses premiers cours. Ainsi était né l'Institut biblique le plus ancien de Terre Sainte et même du monde. A la suite de ses contributions archéologiques et épigraphiques, l'Ecole fut ensuite reconnue en 1920 par le Gouvernement Français, comme Ecole Archéologique Française de Jérusalem.

Depuis bientôt cent ans, l'E.B.A.F. assure sa mission d'enseignement et de recherche dans les diverses disciplines touchant à la Bible, en privilégiant suivant l'intuition du Père Lagrange le travail sur le terrain, et en affirmant sa vocation internationale et œcuménique.

Diverses manifestations sont prévues en France en 1990 pour célébrer le Centenaire de l'Ecole Biblique et permettront d'apprécier le chemin accompli depuis un siècle dans les études relatives à la Bible et à l'archéologie Proche-Orientale. La plupart sont regroupées à Lyon du 20 au 22 novembre, avant la séance solennelle de l'Institut de France le 23 novembre à Paris.

Les séances du Colloque auront lieu à la Maison Saint Joseph à Francheville, dans le proche banlieue de Lyon; les participants au Colloque y seront normalement logés. Les déplacements entre Francheville et Lyon seront assurés par autocar pour les diverses manifestations.

Les actes du Colloque seront publiés ultérieurement par les Editions du Cerf à Paris.

Les personnes désireuses de participer aux journées du Centenaire à Lyon et Paris du 20 au 23 novembre 1990 sont invitées à s'adresser au:

Secrétariat Lyonnais du Centenaire de l'E.B.A.F.
Faculté de Théologie de l'Institut Catholique de Lyon
25 rue du Plat
F-69288 Lyon Cedex (tel: 72.32.50.23)

Instructions for Contributors

General Norms

1. All articles, critical notes and book reviews submitted for publication in *Biblica* are expected to conform to these instructions. If they depart from them in major ways, manuscripts may be returned to authors for retyping before they are considered for publication. It is assumed that submitted manuscripts are in final form with no changes expected later. Authors of articles receive page-proofs which they are expected to read carefully, check against the manuscript, correct and return promptly. Proofs are not sent to reviewers of books.

2. *Biblica* accepts contributions in Latin, English, French, German, Italian and Spanish.

3. In no case should articles that appear elsewhere in the same or a different language be submitted to this journal.

4. A contribution submitted for publication as an article (*commentatio*) should be accompanied by a summary of about 100 words giving its main point and principal arguments.

5. The manuscript must be typewritten, on one side of the sheet only, on white paper of good quality and of standard business-letter size in the author's country. Paper with surface glazed for easy erasure is not to be used. Typewriters with italic characters only or with small caps only should not be used. Words to be italicized should be underlined, *not* typed in italics (e.g., with an IBM italic element). See below, no. 10. Computer-written contributions must be of letter quality.

6. All lines are to be double-spaced, even those of footnotes and of indented quotations. A margin of at least 2,5 cm. is to be left above and below the text and on each side of it.

7. In articles or notes discussing biblical verses or verses from ancient texts the author should provide the text of the verse and a translation at the beginning of the discussion. In general, ancient texts cited or reconstructed should be accompanied by a translation.

8. References to Scripture should use this form: Gen 2,4-8; Isa 41,3.7.9; 1 Cor 4,11-5,3. References to one or more verses of texts previously cited should be as follows: v. 1; vv. 2-4. For abbreviations of the books of the Bible see below, no. 23.

9. Special material (e.g., lists, tables, charts, diagrams) should be typed (or drawn) on sheets separate from the main text. However, the location of such material in the main text should be indicated clearly (e.g., "insert chart I here").

10. Words to be printed in italics (e.g., titles of books and periodicals, transliterations, foreign words) must be underlined once.

Quotations

11. Quotations of four or more typewritten lines in any language will be printed as a separate, indented paragraph, *without* opening and closing quotation marks. In shorter quotations, closing quotation marks must be placed *before* the raised arabic numeral which indicates a footnote and before any other punctuation, e.g., "... the Lord"(¹).

12. Accuracy in verbatim quotations requires that the spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and abbreviations of the publication being quoted be reproduced exactly, even if they differ from the style of this journal. Should the quotation contain an error, this may be indicated by [*sic*] or [?].

Footnotes

13. All footnotes are to be placed at the end of the article and on pages separate from it, typed with double-spacing and numbered consecutively. They must not be included either in the body of the article or at the bottom of the pages. A raised arabic numeral within parentheses should follow the appropriate word in the text and precede the punctuation, if any, to call attention to the note. On the footnote pages, numbers are to be placed in parentheses; no period is to be used after the number.

14. All references to books and articles are to be placed in the footnotes and should be given as follows:

a) *Books*:

T. R. HENN, *The Bible as Literature* (London - New York 1970) 9-15.
NB: The publisher's name is *not* mentioned.

F. M. ABEL, *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe* (EB; Paris 1952), II, 105-129.

H. W. WOLFF, *Dodekapropheton I: Hosea* (BKAT 14/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn ²1965) XIV-XVII.

W. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père! La prière du Christ et des chrétiens* (AnBib 19; Rome 1963) 50, n. 189.

P. W. SKEHAN - A. A. DI LELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; Garden City, NY 1987) 55-56.

b) *Articles* (from periodicals, collected works and *Festschriften*):

E. VOGT, "Das Wachstum des alten Stadtgebietes von Jerusalem", *Bib* 48 (1967) 337, 339.

E. JENNI, "'anan, Wolke", *THAT* II, 351-353.

F. F. BRUCE, "The Theology and Interpretation of the Old Testament", *Tradition and Interpretation. Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Studies* (ed. G. W. ANDERSON) (Oxford 1979) 385-416.

H. GESE, "Natus ex virgine", *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (FS. G. von Rad; [Hrsg. H. W. WOLFF] München 1971) 75.

S. BROCK, "Genesis 22 in Syriac Tradition", *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy. Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire* (éd.

P. CASETTI – O. KEEL – A. SCHENKER) (OBO 38; Fribourg – Göttingen 1981) 1-30.

c) *Classical and patristic works:*

Homer, *Il.* 24:200.

Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.3.21; 4.15.3-4.

15. Once the full information on a book or article has been given, a shortened title, not an acronym, is to be used (for example, WOLFF, *Hosea*, 138). General references to works previously cited, e.g., *op. cit.*, *art. cit.*, *a.a.O.*, etc., must be avoided. Also avoid f. or ff. (and equivalents) for “following” pages or verses; the proper page numbers or verse numbers are to be cited.

Non-Latin Alphabets

16. Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Coptic and Syriac, both blocks of text and isolated words, can be set in their proper characters by the printer of this journal. Normally the unpointed consonantal text of Hebrew or Aramaic is to be used. If the discussion calls for the vocalized form of the words, they may be pointed or transliterated. For transliteration systems see n. 19.

17. If transliteration is used, all transliterated words must be underlined and vocalization must be included.

18. Whenever possible, non-transliterated Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Coptic, Syriac and other non-Latin alphabets should be typewritten; otherwise the author should write the words *clearly* and carefully in ink, and in forms of the letters that correspond to the font of Hebrew (etc.) type used in this journal.

Transliterations

19. The following systems are recommended for Hebrew and Greek, but other systems accepted in different countries may be used, if consistent:

Transliteration of Hebrew

Consonants

ʾ = א	z = ז	m = מ	q = ק
b = ב	h = ה	n = נ	r = ר
g = ג	t = ט	s = ס	š = שׁ
d = ד	y = י	c = צ	ṣ̌ = שׂ
h = ח	k = כ	p = פ	t = ת
w = ו	l = ל	š = שׂ	

Note: The presence or absence of *dageš lene* in the *begadkepat* letters is not to be shown. Consonants with *dageš forte* are written double.

Vowels (shown as preceded by *b*)

With <i>matres lectionis</i>	Without <i>matres lectionis</i>	With <i>vocal šwa</i>
<i>bā</i> = בָּה	<i>bā</i> = בַּה	<i>ba</i> = בַּה
<i>bō</i> = בּוּ	<i>bō</i> = בֹּה	<i>bo</i> = בֹּה
<i>bū</i> = בּוּ	<i>bū</i> = בֹּה	<i>bu</i> = בֹּה
<i>bē</i> = בֵּי	<i>bē</i> = בֵּה	
<i>bē</i> = בֵּי		<i>be</i> = בֵּה
<i>bī</i> = בִּי	<i>bī</i> = בִּה	<i>bi</i> = בִּה
		<i>bē</i> = בֵּה

bāh = בָּה, *bā'* = בָּא, even where א is merely a *mater lectionis*.

bēh = בֵּה, and *beh* = בֵּה, although ה is merely a *mater lectionis* here.

patah furtivum: *rūah* = רוּחַ, simply indicated as *patah*.

Transliteration of Greek

α = <i>a</i>	θ = <i>th</i>	ω = <i>ō</i>
η = <i>ē</i>	φ = <i>ph</i>	φ = <i>ō</i>
η = <i>ē</i>	χ = <i>ch</i>	' = ' (or <i>h</i>)
	ψ = <i>ps</i>	

υ = *y*, but not in diphthongs

20. Transliteration of Coptic

The system described above for Greek is to be used for those Coptic letters that are the same as Greek. For the seven extra characters at the end of the alphabet, the following should be used: š for šay, *f* for fay, *h* for hay, *h* for hori, č for čanča, *k'* for *k'ima* and *ti* for *ti* (the digraph). The supralinear stroke should be omitted.

Abbreviations

Contributors to *Biblica* are requested to use the following abbreviations:

21. *General abbreviations*: *c.* (*circa*); *s.a.* (*sine anno*); *s.l.* (*sine loco*); *v.* (*vide*). The commonest short abbreviations are exceptions and should be written in roman (not italics): cf., e.g.; etc., ib.; ibid.; id.; i.e.; MS(S); NB; q.v.; sc.; s.v.; v.; V. The commonest short abbreviations in the author's language are to be written in roman too: for example: u.s.w.; m.E.; Kap.; chap.; cap.; p.; S.; col.; etc.

22. The abbreviations OT (AT); NT; LXX (Sept.); MT; QL; Vg; VL; G (or the equivalent in the author's language) are always to be used with no punctuation, and in roman characters.

23. *Abbreviations of the names of biblical books* (in roman characters with no punctuation):

Latin	English	French	German	Spanish	Italian
Gn	Gen	Gn	Gen	Gn	Gn
Ex	Exod	Ex	Ex	Ex	Es
Lv	Lev	Lv	Lev	Lv	Lv
Nm	Num	Nb	Num	Nm	Nm
Dt	Deut	Dt	Dtn	Dt	Dt
Ios	Josh	Jos	Jos	Jos	Gs
Idc	Judg	Jg	Ri	Jue	Gdc
Rt	Ru	Rt	Rut	Rut	Rt
1-2 Sm	1-2 Sam	1-2 S	1-2 Sam	1-2 Sam	1-2 Sam
3-4 Rg	1-2 Kgs	1-2 R	1-2 Kön	1-2 Re	1-2 Re
1-2 Par	1-2 Chr	1-2 Ch	1-2 Chr	1-2 Cr	1-2 Cr
Esd	Ezra	Esd	Esr	Esd	Esd
Neh	Neh	Ne	Neh	Ne	Ne
Tob	Tob	Tb	Tob	Tb	Tb
Idt	Jdt	Jdt	Jdt	Jdt	Gdt
Est	Esth	Est	Est	Est	Est
Iob	Job	Jb	Ijob	Job	Gb
Ps(s)	Ps(s)	Ps(s)	Ps(s)	Sl	Sal
Prv	Prov	Pr	Spr	Pr	Pro
Qoh	Qoh	Qo	Koh	Qo	Qo
Ct	Cant	Ct	Hld	Ct	Ct
Sap	Wis	Sg	Weish	Sb	Sap
Sir	Sir	Si	Sir	Sir	Sir
Is	Isa	Is	Jes	Is	Is
Ier	Jer	Jr	Jer	Jr	Ger
Lm	Lam	Lm	Klgl	Lm	Lam
Bar	Bar	Ba	Bar	Ba	Ba
Ez	Ezek	Ez	Ez	Ez	Ez
Dn	Dan	Dn	Dan	Dn	Dn
Os	Hos	Os	Hos	Os	Os
Ioel	Joel	Jl	Joel	Jl	Gl
Am	Amos	Am	Am	Am	Am
Abd	Obad	Ab	Obd	Ab	Abd
Ion	Jonah	Jon	Jon	Jon	Gio
Mich	Mic	Mi	Mich	Mi	Mic
Nah	Nah	Na	Nah	Na	Na
Hab	Hab	Ha	Hab	Ha	Ab
Soph	Zeph	So	Zef	So	Sof
Ag	Hag	Ag	Hag	Ag	Ag
Zach	Zech	Za	Sach	Za	Zc
Mal	Mal	Ml	Mal	Ml	Ml
1-2 Mac	1-2 Macc	1-2 M	1-2 Makk	1-2 Mac	1-2 Mac

Latin	English	French	German	Spanish	Italian
Mt	Matt	Mt	Mt	Mt	Mt
Mc	Mark	Mc	Mk	Mc	Mc
Lc	Luke	Lc	Lk	Lc	Lc
Io	John	Jn	Joh	Jn	Gv
Act	Acts	Ac	Apğ	He	At
Rom	Rom	Rm	Röm	Ro	Rm
1-2 Cor	1-2 Cor	1-2 Co	1-2 Kor	1-2 Cor	1-2 Cor
Gal	Gal	Ga	Gal	Ga	Gal
Eph	Eph	Ep	Eph	Ef	Ef
Philp	Phil	Ph	Phil	Flp	Fil
Col	Col	Col	Kol	Col	Col
1-2 Thess	1-2 Thess	1-2 Th	1-2 Thess	1-2 Te	1-2 Ts
1-2 Tim	1-2 Tim	1-2 Tm	1-2 Tim	1-2 Tim	1-2 Tm
Tit	Titus	Tt	Tit	Tit	Tt
Philm	Phlm	Phm	Phlm	Flm	Fm
Heb	Heb	He	Hebr	Heb	Eb
Iac	Jas	Jc	Jak	Sant	Gc
1-2 Pe	1-2 Pet	1-2 P	1-2 Petr	1-2 Pe	1-2 Pt
1-3 Io	1-3 John	1-3 Jn	1-3 Joh	1-3 Jn	1-3 Gv
Ids	Jude	Jude	Jud	Jds	Gd
Apoc	Rev	Ap	Offb	Ap	Ap

24. *Abbreviations of names of Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts*

CD	Cairo (Genizah text of the) Damascus (Document)	1QpHab	<i>Pesher on Habakkuk from Qumran Cave 1</i>
Hev	Nahal Hever texts	1QM	<i>Milhamāh (War Scroll)</i>
Mas	Masada texts	1QS	<i>Serek hayyadah (Rule of the Community. Manual of Discipline)</i>
Mird	Khirbet Mird texts	1QSa	<i>Appendix A (Rule of the Congregation) to 1QS</i>
Mur	Wadi Murabba'at texts	1QSB	<i>Appendix B (Blessings) to 1QS</i>
P	Pesher (commentary)	3Q15	<i>Copper Scroll from Qumran Cave 3</i>
Q	Qumran	4QFlor	<i>Florilegium (or Eschatological Midrashim) from Qumran Cave 4</i>
1Q 2Q	Numbered caves of Qumran, yielding written material; followed by abbreviation of biblical or apocryphal book	4QMess ar	<i>Aramaic "Messianic" text from Qumran Cave 4</i>
3Q etc.		4QPrNab	<i>Prayer of Nabonidus from Qumran Cave 4</i>
QL	Qumran literature	4QTestim	<i>Testimonia text from Qumran Cave 4</i>
1QapGen	Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1		
1QH	<i>Hôdāyôt (Thanksgiving Hymns)</i> from Qumran Cave 1		
1QIsa ^{ab}	First or second copy of Isaiah from Qumran Cave 1		

4QTLevi	Testament of Levi from Qumran Cave 4	11QMelch	Melchizedek text from Qumran Cave 11
4QPhyl	Phylacteries from Qum- ran Cave 4	11QtgJob	Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11

For further sigla, and for an explanation of the system of abbreviation, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Major Publications and Tools for Study* (SBL SBS 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975) 3-53. Note in particular: 4Q 177 12-13 ii 3,5-8 means text 177 from Qumran Cave 4 (joined) fragments 12-13, column ii, lines 3 and 5-8. NB Lower-case roman numerals are used here to indicate columns and to distinguish them from fragment numbers and line numbers.

25. Abbreviations of Targumic material

For the Qumran Targums, the standard system for Qumran literature is to be used; thus: 4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, 11QtgJob, followed by column and line numbers. If it is necessary to specify the biblical passage, the following form should be used: 11QtgJob 38,3-4 (= 42,10 in the Hebrew text).

For other materials, Tg(s). is to be used, if the title is spelled out; thus: "In Tg. Onqelos we find..."; or "In Tgs. Neofiti and Onqelos the...". But abbreviated titles, as given below, are to be used when followed by chapter and verse numbers of a biblical book: Tg. Onq. Gen 1,3-4; Tg. Neof. Exod 12,1-2.5-6.

Tg. Onq.	Targum Onqelos	Tg. Neof.	Targum Neofiti I
Tg. Neb	Targum of the Prophets	Tg. Ps.-J.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Tg. Ket	Targum of the Writings	Tg. Yer. I	Targum Yerusalmi I*
Frg. Tg.	Fragmentary Targum	Tg. Yer. II	Targum Yerusalmi II*
Sam. Tg.	Samaritan Targum	Yem. Tg.	Yemenite Targum
Tg. Isa	Targum of Isaiah	Tg. Esth I, II	First or Second Targum of Esther
Pal. Tgs.	Palestinian Targums		

* optional title

26. Abbreviations of tractates in Mishna, Tosefta and Talmud

To distinguish tractates which have the same name in the Mishna, Tosefta, Babylonian Talmud and Jerusalem Talmud, use m., t., b., or y. before the title of the tractate. Thus, m. Pea a 8,2; b. Shab 31a; y. Mak. 2,31d; t. Pea 1,4. References to Zuckerman's or to Lieberman's editions of the Tosefta should be given as follows: Zuck. 18 (= page 18); Lieb. 41-42 (= pages 41 and 42).

Ar	'Arakhin	Naz	Nazir
Av	Avot	Ned	Nedarim

AZ	'Avoda Zara	Neg	Nega'im
BB	Baba Batra	Nid	Nidda
Bekh	Bekhorot	Ohal	Ohalot
Ber	Berakhot	Orl	'Orla
Bes	Beša (Yom Ṭov)	Par	Para
Bik	Bikkurim	Pea	Pe'a
BM	Baba Meši'a	Pes	Pesaḥim
BQ	Baba Qamma	Qid	Qiddushin
Dem	Demai	Qin	Qinnim
Ed	'Eduyot	RHSh	Rosh HaShana
Er	'Eruvin	San	Sanhedrin
Git	Giṭṭin	Shab	Shabbat
Hag	Ḥagiga	Sheq	Sheqalim
Hal	Ḥalla	Shevi	Shevi'it
Hor	Horayot	Shevu	Shevu'ot
Hul	Ḥullin	Sot	Sotā
Kel	Kelim	Suk	Sukka
Ker	Keritot	Taan	Ta'anit
Ket	Ketubbot	Tam	Tamid
Kil	Kil'ayim	Tem	Temura
Maas	Ma'asrot	Ter	Terumot
Mak	Makkot	TevY	Ṭevul Yom
Makh	Makhshirin	Toh	Ṭoharot
Meg	Megilla	Uq	'Uqṣin
Meil	Me'ila	Yad	Yadayim
Men	Menahot	Yev	Yevamot
Mid	Middot	Yom	Yoma
Miq	Miqwa'ot	Yom Ṭov	see Bes (Beša)
MQ	Mo'ed Qaṭan	Zav	Zavim
MSh	Ma'aser Sheni	Zev	Zevaḥim

27. *Abbreviations of other rabbinical works* (for Midrashim on biblical books the standard biblical abbreviations may also be used, e.g., GenR = BerR; SifDeut = SifDev):

AgBer	Aggadat Bereshit	EkhaR	Ekha Rabba
AgEst	Aggadat Ester	EkhaZ	Ekha Zuṭa
AgShir	Aggadat Shir HaShirim	EstR	Ester Rabba
ARN	Avot deRabbi Natan	Evel	Rabbati see Sem (Semaḥot)
b	Talmud Bavli	Kalla	
BatM	Bate Midrashot	LeqT	Leqaḥ Ṭov
BemR	Bemidbar Rabba	m	Mishna
BerR	Bereshit Rabba	MegTaan	Megillat Ta'anit
BerRbti	Bereshit Rabbati	MekhSh	Mekhilta deRabbi
BerZ	Bereshit Zuṭa		Shim'on b. Yoḥai
BHM	Bet HaMidrash	MekhY	Mekhilta deRabbi Yish-
DER	Derekh Ereš Rabba		ma'el
DevR	Devarim Rabba	MHG Bam	Midrash HaGadol Bam-
DEZ	Derekh Ereš Zuṭa		idbar

MHG Ber	Midrash HaGadol Bere-shit	RutZ	Rut Zuṭa
MHG Dev	Midrash HaGadol Devarim	SAME	Sifre deAggadta Megillat Ester
MHG Shem	Midrash HaGadol Shemot	SekhT	Sekhel Tov
MHG Wa	Midrash HaGadol Wayiqra	Sem	Semaḥot (Evel Rabbati)
Midrash Zuta	see EkhaZ, QohZ, RutZ, ShirZ	SER	Seder Eliyyahu Rabba
MMish	Midrash Mishle	SEZ	Seder Eliyyahu Zuṭa
MShem	Midrash Shemu'el	ShemR	Shemot Rabba
MShir	Midrash Shir HaShirim	ShirR	Shir HaShirim Rabba
MTann	Midrash Tanna'im ("Mekhilta leSefer Devarim")	ShirZ	Shir HaShirim Zuṭa
MTeh	Midrash Tehillim (Shoḥer Tov)	Shoḥer Tov	see MTeh (Midrash Tehillim)
OsM	Oṣar Midrashim (ed. Eissenstein)	SifBam	Sifre Bamidbar
Pesiqta Zuṭarta	see LeqT (Leqaḥ Tov)	SifDev	Sifre Devarim
PesK	Pesiqta deRav Kahana	Sifra	Sifra
PesR	Pesiqta Rabbati	SifZ	Sifre Zuṭa
PRE	Pirqe deRabbi Eli'ezer	Sof	Soferim
QohR	Qohelet Rabba	SOR	Seder 'Olam Rabba
QohZ	Qohelet Zuṭa	SOZ	Seder 'Olam Zuṭa
RutR	Rut Rabba	t	Tosefta
		Tan	Tanḥuma
		TanB	Tanḥuma ed. Buber
		Tanna deBe	Eliyyahu
			see SER, SEZ (Seder Eliyyahu Rabba/Zuṭa)
		WaR	Wayiqra Rabba
		y	Talmud Yerushalmi
		Yalq	Yalquṭ Shim'oni
		YalqM	Yalquṭ Makhiri

28. *Abbreviations of Nag Hammadi tractates*

Tract.	English Title	Eng. Abbrev.	French Abbrev.	German Abbrev.
I,1	<i>The Prayer of the Apostle Paul (+ Colophon)</i>	Pr. Paul	PrPaul	OrPl
I,2	<i>The Apocryphon of James</i>	Ap.Jas.	ApocrJac	ApJac
I,3	<i>The Gospel of Truth</i>	Gos.Truth	EvVer	EV
I,4	<i>The Treatise on Resurrection</i>	Treat.Res.	Rheg	Rheg
I,5	<i>The Tripartite Tractate</i>	Tri.Trac.	TracTri	TractTrip
II,1	<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>	Ap.John	ApocrJn	AJ
II,2	<i>The Gospel of Thomas</i>	Gos.Thom.	EvTh	EvThom
II,3	<i>The Gospel of Philip</i>	Gos.Phil.	EvPhil	EvPhil
II,4	<i>The Hypostasis of the Archons</i>	Hyp.Arch.	HypArch	HA
II,5	<i>On the Origin of the World</i>	Orig.World	OrMond	OrMundi

Tract.	English Title	Eng. Abbrev.	French Abbrev.	German Abbrev.
II,6	<i>The Exegesis on the Soul</i>	Exeg. Soul	ExAm	ExAn
II,7	<i>The Book of Thomas the Contender (+ colophon)</i>	Thom.Cont.	ThAthl	LibThom
III,1	<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>	Ap.John	ApocrJn	AJ
III,2	<i>The Gospel of the Egyptians</i>	Gos.Eg.	EvEgypt	ÄgEv
III,3	<i>Eugnostos the Blessed</i>	Eugnostos	Eug	Eugn
III,4	<i>The Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>	Soph.Jes.Chr.	SJC	SJC
III,5	<i>The Dialogue of the Savior</i>	Dial. Sav.	DialSauv	Dial
IV,1	<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>	Ap.John	ApocrJn	AJ
IV,2	<i>The Gospel of the Egyptians</i>	Gos.Eg.	EvEgypt	ÄgEv
V,1	<i>Eugnostos the Blessed</i>	Eugnostos	Eug	Eugn
V,2	<i>The Apocalypse of Paul</i>	Apoc.Paul	ApocPaul	ApcPl
V,3	<i>The First Apocalypse of James</i>	1.Apoc.Jas.	1ApocJac	1ApcJac
V,4	<i>The Second Apocalypse of James</i>	2.Apoc.Jas.	2ApocJac	2ApcJac
V,5	<i>The Apocalypse of Adam</i>	Apoc.Adam	ApocAd	ApcAd
VI,1	<i>The Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles</i>	Acts Pet.12 Apost.	AcPi12 Ap	ActPt12- Ap
VI,2	<i>The Thunder Perfect Mind</i>	Thund.	Brontè	Bronte
VI,3	<i>Authoritative Teaching</i>	Auth.Teach.	AuthLog	AuthLog
VI,4	<i>The Concept of Our Great Power</i>	Great.Pow.	GrPuis	Noema
VI,5	<i>Plato, Republic 588 B-589 B</i>		PlatoRep	ExcPlat
VI,6	<i>The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth</i>	Disc.8-9	OgdEnn	OgdEnn
VI,7	<i>The Prayer of Thanksgiving (+ scribal note)</i>	Pr.Thanks.	PriAcGr	PrecHerm
VI,8	<i>Asclepius 21-29</i>	Asclepius	Ascl	Askl
VII,1	<i>The Paraphrase of Shem</i>	Paraph.Shem	ParaSem	ParSem
VII,2	<i>The Second Treatise of the Great Seth</i>	Treat.Seth	GrSeth	2LogSeth
VII,3	<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>	Apoc.Pet.	ApocPi	ApcPt
VII,4	<i>The Teachings of Silvanus (+ colophon)</i>	Teach.Silv.	Silv	Silv
VII,5	<i>The Three Steles of Seth (+ colophon)</i>	Steles Seth	3StSeth	StelSeth
VIII,1	<i>Zostrianos</i>	Zost.	Zost	Zostr
VIII,2	<i>The Letter of Peter to Philip</i>	Ep.Pet.Phil.	PiPhil	EpPt
IX,1	<i>Melchizedek</i>	Melch.	Melch	Melch
IX,2	<i>The Thought of Norea</i>	Norea	Nor	Norea
IX,3	<i>The Testimony of Truth</i>	Testim.Truth	TemVer	TestVer
X,1	<i>Marsanes</i>	Marsanes	Mar	Marsanes

Tract.	English Title	Eng. Abbrev.	French Abbrev.	German Abbrev.
XI,1	<i>The Interpretation of Knowledge</i>	Interpr.Know.	InterpGn	Inter
XI,2	<i>A Valentinian Exposition</i>	Val.Exp.	ExpVal	ExpVal
XI,2a	<i>On the Anointing</i>			
XI,2b	<i>On Baptism A</i>	On Bap. A	BapA	BaptA
XI,2c	<i>On Baptism B</i>	On Bap. B	BapB	BaptB
XI,2d	<i>On the Eucharist A</i>	On Euch.A	EuchA	EuchA
XI,2e	<i>On the Eucharist B</i>	On Euch.B	EuchB	EuchB
XI,3	<i>Allogenes</i>	Allogenes	Allog	Allogenēs
XI,4	<i>Hypsiphronē</i>	Hypsiph.	Hyps	Hyps
XII,1	<i>The Sentences of Sextus</i>	Sent.Sextus	SSext	SentSext
XII,2	<i>The Gospel of Truth</i>	Gos.Truth	EvVer	EV
XII,3	<i>Fragments</i>		Frm	
XIII,1	<i>Trimorphic Protennoia</i>	Trim.Prot.	PrôTri	Proten-noia
XIII,2	<i>On the Origin of the World</i>	Orig.World	OrMond	OrMundi
BG 8502,1	<i>The Gospel of Mary</i>	Gos.Mary	EvMar	EvMar
BG 8502,2	<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>	Ap.John	ApocrJn	AJ
BG 8502,3	<i>The Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>	Soph.Jes.Chr.	SJC	SJC
BG 8502,4	<i>The Acts of Peter</i>	Act.Pet.	ActPi	ActPt

NB Authors who write in Italian or Spanish are requested to use, as much as possible, the French abbreviations.

29. Abbreviations of periodicals, reference works and series

For abbreviations not found in the following list, the abbreviations of S. SCHWERTNER, *International glossary of abbreviations for theology and related subjects* (= IATAG), Berlin – New York 1974, W. de Gruyter, should be used. The present list tries to adopt as much as possible the abbreviations of *CBQ*, *Hermeneia*, *HTR*, *JBL* and IATAG. Titles of periodicals and books are italicized (hence underlined in the MS), but titles of serials are set in roman characters, as are acronyms of authors' names when they are used as sigla).

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research	AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AB	Anchor Bible		
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers	AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
ADAJ	Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan	AHw	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i>
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>	AION	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli</i>

AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>	ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AJAS	<i>American Journal of Arabic Studies</i>	AusBR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i>	AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
AJT	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>	BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
ALBO	Analecta Lovaniensia biblica et orientalia	BAC	Biblioteca de autores cristianos
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums	BAGD	W. Bauer-W. F. Arndt-F. W. Gingrich-F. W. Danker, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica	BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeologist Reader</i>
ANEP	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near East in Pictures</i>	BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
ANESTP	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near East Supplementary Texts and Pictures</i>	BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
ANET	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i>	BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia	BCSR	<i>Bulletin of the Council on the Study of Religion</i>
Anton	Antonianum	BDB	F. Brown-S. R. Driver-C. A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament	BeO	<i>Bibbia e oriente</i>
AP	J. Marouzeau (ed.), <i>L'Année Philologique</i>	BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium
APOT	R. H. Charles (ed.), <i>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i>	BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
ARM	Archives royales de Mari	BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
ArOr	Archiv orientální	BHK	R. Kittel, <i>Biblia Hebraica</i>
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft	BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici Upsaliensis	BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
ASSR	Archives des sciences sociales des religions	Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute	BibB	Biblische Beiträge
ATABh	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen	BibLeb	<i>Bibel und Leben</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments (AThANT)	BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
		BibS(F)	Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895-) (BSt)
		BibS(N)	Biblische Studien (Neukirchen, 1951-) (BibSt)

<i>BIES</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society (= Yehodiot)</i>	<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum</i>
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale</i>	<i>CJT</i>	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>	<i>CNT</i>	<i>Commentaire du Nouveau Testament</i>
<i>BK</i>	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>	<i>ConB</i>	<i>Coniectanea biblica</i>
<i>BKAT</i>	<i>Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament</i>	<i>ConNT</i>	<i>Coniectanea neotestamentica</i>
<i>BL</i>	<i>Book List</i>	<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium</i>
<i>BLit</i>	<i>Bibel und Liturgie</i>	<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>	<i>CTA</i>	A. Herdner, <i>Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques</i>
<i>BO</i>	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>	<i>DACL</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>	<i>DBS</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>	<i>DISO</i>	C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, <i>Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest</i>
<i>BSO(A)S</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies</i>	<i>DJD</i>	<i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>	<i>DOTT</i>	D. W. Thomas (ed.), <i>Documents from Old Testament Times</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>	<i>DTT</i>	<i>Dansk teologisk tidsskrift</i>
<i>BWANT</i>	<i>Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament</i>	<i>EB</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>	<i>EDB</i>	L. F. Hartman (ed.), <i>Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible</i>
<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZAW</i>	<i>EHAT</i>	<i>Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>BZNW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZNW</i>	<i>EKKNT</i>	<i>Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>BZRGG</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZRGG</i>	<i>EKL</i>	<i>Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon</i>
<i>CAD</i>	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i>	<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> (1971)
<i>CAH</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>	<i>EnchBib</i>	<i>Enchiridion biblicum</i>
<i>CAT</i>	<i>Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament</i>	<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos Jahrbuch</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>	<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
<i>CBQMS</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>	<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>CCath</i>	<i>Corpus Catholicorum</i>	<i>ÉTR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
<i>CChr</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum</i>		
<i>CIG</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum</i>		
<i>CII</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Iudaicarum</i>		
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i>		

EvK	Evangelische Kommen- tare	HSM	Harvard Semitic Mono- graphs
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>	HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>	HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ExpTim	<i>Expository Times</i>	HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Re- view</i>
FBBS	Facet Books, Biblical Ser- ies	HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
FC	Fathers of the Church	HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments	IB	Interpreter's Bible
FzB	Forschung zur Bibel	ICC	International Critical Commentary
GCS	Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller	IDB	G. A. Buttrick (ed.), <i>In- terpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
GAG	W. von Soden, <i>Grundriss der akkadischen Gram- matik</i>	IDBSup	Supplementary volume to IDB
GKB	Gesenius - Kautzsch - Bergsträsser, <i>Hebräische Grammatik</i>	IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Jour- nal</i>
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Gram- mar</i> , ed. E. Kautzsch, tr. A. E. Cowley	Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
GNT	see UBSGNT	ITQ	<i>Irish Theological Quar- terly</i>
GZNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament	JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
GOTR	<i>Greek Orthodox Theologi- cal Review</i>	JAC	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman and By- zantine Studies</i>	JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
Greg	<i>Gregorianum</i>	JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
HALAT	W. Baumgartner et al., <i>Hebräisches und ara- mäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i>	JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Litera- ture</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament	JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Reli- gion</i>
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion	JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
HeyJ	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>	JDS	Judean Desert Studies
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Al- ten Testament	JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Ar- chaeology</i>
HKNT	Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament	JEOL	<i>Jaarbericht... Ex oriente lux</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament	JES	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
HNTC	Harper's NT Commentar- ies	JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Stud- ies</i>
HR	<i>History of Religions</i>	JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>

JMES	<i>Journal of Middle Eastern Studies</i>	LCC	Library of Christian Classics
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>	LCL	Loeb Classical Library
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>	LD	Lectio divina
JPOS	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>	Leš	Lešonenu
JPSV	<i>Jewish Publication Society Version</i>	LQ	Lutheran Quarterly
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>	LR	Lutherische Rundschau
JQRMS	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series</i>	LSJ	Liddell-Scott-Jones, Greek-English Lexicon
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>	LTK	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (LThK)
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>	MDOG	Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
JReIS	<i>Journal of Religious Studies</i>	MeyerK	H. A. W. Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
JRH	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>	MGWJ	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>	MNTC	Moffatt NT Commentary
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>	MScRel	Mélanges de science religieuse
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>	MTZ	Münchener theologische Zeitschrift
JSNTSS	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</i>	MVAG	Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>	NA ²⁶	Nestle-Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 26th. ed.
JSOTSS	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>	NAB	New American Bible
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>	NCE	M. R. P. McGuire et al. (eds.), <i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
Judaica	<i>Judaica: Beiträge zum Verständnis...</i>	NEB	New English Bible
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i>	NedTTs	Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift
KAT	E. Sellin (ed.), <i>Kommentar zum A. T.</i>	Neot	Neotestamentica
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i>	NHC	Nag Hammadi Corpus
KD	<i>Kerygma und Dogma</i>	NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
KIT	<i>Kleine Texte</i>	NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
		NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift
		NT	Novum Testamentum
		NTS	Novum Testamentum, Supplements

NRT	<i>La nouvelle revue théologique (NRTh)</i>		<i>ment of Antiquities in Palestine</i>
NTA	<i>New Testament Abstracts</i>	RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen	RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch	RArch	<i>Revue archéologique</i>
NTF	Neutestamentliche Forschungen	RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>	RBén	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies	RE	<i>Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>
Numen	<i>Numen: International Review for the History of Religions</i>	RechBib	<i>Recherches bibliques</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis	REg	<i>Revue d'égyptologie</i>
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications	REJ	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
OLP	Orientalia Lovaniensia periodica	RelS	<i>Religious Studies</i>
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>	RelSRev	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
Or	<i>Orientalia (Rome)</i>	RES	<i>Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique</i>
OrAnt	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>	RevExp	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
OrChr	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>	RevistB	<i>Revista biblica</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library	RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studien</i>	RevScRel	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>	RevSém	<i>Revue sémitique</i>
PEFQS	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement</i>	RevThom	<i>Revue thomiste</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>	RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
PG	J. Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>	RHE	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>
PJ	<i>Palästina-Jahrbuch</i>	RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
PL	J. Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i>	RHR	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
PO	<i>Patrologia orientalis</i>	RivB	<i>Rivista biblica</i>
PRU	<i>Le Palais royal d'Ugarit</i>	RNT	<i>Regensburger Neues Testament</i>
PVTG	<i>Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece</i>	RQ	<i>Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte</i>
PW	Pauly-Wissowa, <i>Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>	RR	<i>Review of Religion</i>
QDAP	<i>Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine</i>	RSO	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali</i>
		RSPT	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
		RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
		RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>

RTL	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>	SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
RTP	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>	SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament	SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
SB	Sources bibliques	SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge	SPap	<i>Studia papyrologica</i>
SBFLA	<i>Studii biblici franciscani Liber annuus</i>	SR	<i>Studies in Religion Sciences religieuses</i>
SBLASP	Society of Biblical Literature Abstracts and Seminar Papers	SSS	Semitic Study Series
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series	ST	<i>Studia theologica (StTh)</i>
SBLMasS	SBL Masoretic Studies	STÅ	<i>Svensk teologisk årsskrift</i>
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series	STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SBL SBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study	STK	<i>Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift</i>
SBLSCS	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies	Str-B	(H. Strack and) P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</i>
SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations	StudNeot	<i>Studia neotestamentica</i>
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien	StudNeotS	<i>Studia neotestamentica Subsidia</i>
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien	StudOr	<i>Studia orientalia</i>
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology	SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SC	Sources chrétiennes	TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
SCR	<i>Studies in Comparative Religion</i>	TBü	Theologische Bücherei
ScEs	<i>Science et esprit</i>	TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
Scr	<i>Scripture</i>	TDOT	G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i>
ScrB	<i>Scripture Bulletin</i>	TextsS	Texts and Studies
SD	Studies and Documents	TF	<i>Theologische Forschung</i>
SE	<i>Studia Evangelica</i> I, II, III (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], etc.)	TGl	<i>Theologie und Glaube</i>
SEA	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>	THAT	E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds.), <i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
Sef	<i>Sefarad</i>	THKNT	Theologischer Handkom-
Sem	<i>Semitica</i>		
SHT	Studies in Historical Theology		
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity		
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>		
SMSR	<i>Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni</i>		

	mentar zum Neuen Testament	WDB	<i>Westminster Dictionary of the Bible</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>	WHAB	<i>Westminster Historical Atlas of the Bible</i>
TP	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>	WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
TPQ	<i>Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift</i>	WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
TQ	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>	WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>	WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
TRev	<i>Theologische Revue</i>	WZKM	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>	ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>	ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
TT	<i>Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>	ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
TTZ	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>	ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen	ZHT	<i>Zeitschrift für historische Theologie</i>
TWAT	G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>	ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
TWNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>	ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>	ZMR	<i>Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft</i>
UBSGNT	United Bible Societies Greek New Testament	ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>	ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament	ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>
USQR	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>	ZST	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>
UT	C. H. Gordon, <i>Ugaritic Textbook</i>	ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
VF	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>	ZWT	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>
VS	<i>Verbum salutis</i>		
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>		
VTS	<i>Vetus Testamentum Supplements</i>		

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it (unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*).

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Vetus Testamentum

Alt, Albrecht, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (The Biblical Seminar). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1989. x-274 p. 13,9 × 21,4. £10.95/\$17.95.

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel, *Judas Maccabaeus. The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. xvi-672 p. 16 × 23,5. \$125.00.

Bonora, Antonio, *Nahum - Sofonia - Abacuc - Lamentazioni*. Dolore, protesta e speranza (Leggere oggi la Bibbia 1.25). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 1989. 134 p. 13 × 21. Lit. 15.000.

Coote, Robert B. - Ord, David Robert, *The Bible's First History. From Eden to the Court of David with the Yahwist*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1989. x-308 p. 15,7 × 23.

Fox, Michael V., *Qohelet and his Contradictions* (JSOT Supplement Series 71). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 384 p. 14,3 × 22. £25.00/\$42.50.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar (Hrsg.), *Vom Sinai zum Horeb. Stationen alttestamentlicher Glaubensgeschichte*. Würzburg, Echter, 1989. 196 p. 14 × 22,5. DM 29,—.

Langer, Gerhard, *Von Gott Erwählt - Jerusalem. Die Rezeption von Dtn 12 im frühen Judentum*. (Österreichische Biblische Studien 8). Klosterneuberg, Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989. xiii-351 p. 14,7 × 20,7 kart. öS 328/DM 48,80/sfr 43,80.

Martínez Borobio, Emiliano (ed.), *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en Tradición Babilónica*. Vol. I: Josué – Jueces (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 46). Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1989. 359 p. 19 × 27,4.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D., *In Search of God. The Meaning and Message of the Everlasting Names*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1987. xi-251 p. 15,4 × 23,5.

Neveu, Louis, *Au pas des Psaumes*. Lecture organique à trois voix. Tome 1^{er} (Cahiers du Centre de Linguistique et Littérature Religieuses 2). Angers, Université Catholique de l'Ouest, 1988. 197 p. 16 × 24. 115 FF.

Otto, Eckart, *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch»* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 85). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. 209 p. 16 × 23,5.

Reviv, Hanoch, *The Elders in Ancient Israel. A Study of a Biblical Institution*. Jerusalem, The Magnes Press, 1989. 222 p. 15,5 × 22,7. \$22.00.

Schley, Donald G., *Shiloh. A Biblical City in Tradition and History* (JSOT Supplement Series 63). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 256 p. 14,3 × 22. £25.00/\$42.50.

Spieckermann, Hermann, *Heilsgegenwart. Eine Theologie der Psalmen* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 148). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. 342 p. 15,5 × 23. Lw. Dm 118,00; kart. DM 80,00.

Tsumura, David T., *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2. A Linguistic Investigation* (JSOT Supplement Series 83). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 201 p. 14,1 × 22. £22.00/\$33.50.

Vermeulen, Jacques (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah – Le livre d'Isaïe*. Les oracles et leurs relectures. Unité et complexité de l'ouvrage (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 81). Leuven University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1989. x-476 p. 16 × 24,3. 2.700 BF.

Willett, Tom W., *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 4). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 168 p. 14,1 × 22. £22.50/\$37.50.

Novum Testamentum

Aranda Pérez, Gonzalo, *El Evangelio de San Marcos en Copto Sahídico*. Texto de M 569 y aparato crítico (Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» 45). Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988. 150 p. 17 × 24.

Bruce, Frederick F., *Gesù visto dai contemporanei* (Piccola biblioteca teologica 19). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 1989. viii-204 p. 14,5 × 21. Lit. 18.000.

Dalton, William Joseph, *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits*. A Study of 1 Peter 3:18-4:6. Second, fully revised edition (Analecta Biblica 23). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989. 276 p. 16,4 × 23,9. Lit. 42.000.

Epp, E. J. – MacRae, G. W. (eds), *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press – Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. xxxii-601 p. 15,7 × 23,3.

Fortna, Robert T., *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor*. From Narrative Source to Present Gospel (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. xvi-332 p. 14,5 × 22. £17.95.

Georgeot, J.-M., *Evangile selon Saint Marc*. Contribution à la Lectio Divina (Spiritualité 2). Reiningue, La Documentation Cistercienne, 1988. 561 p. 16,5 × 24.

Goulder, Michael D., *Luke A New Paradigm*. Volume I (JSNT Supplement Series 20). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. xi-452 p. 14 × 22. £40.00/\$60.00.

Goulder, Michael D., *Luke A New Paradigm*. Volume II (JSNT Supplement Series 20). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. xi-372 p. 14 × 22. £40.00/\$60.00.

Griepentrog, Wolfgang, *Synopse der gotischen Evangelientexte* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 14). München, R. Kitzinger, 1988. 171 p. 15 × 21. DM 22.80.

Kilgallen, John J., *A Brief Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. iii-319 p. 14 × 20,5. \$14.95.

Lyonnet, Stanislas, *Etudes sur l'Épître aux Romains* (Analecta Biblica 120). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989. ix-387 p. 16,5 × 24. Lit. 48.000.

Moxnes, Halvor, *The Economy of the Kingdom*. Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel (Overtures to Biblical Theology). Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1988. xxii-183 p. 14 × 21,3.

Orton, David E., *The Understanding Scribe*. Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal (JSNT Supplement Series 25). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. 280 p. £25.00/\$37.50.

Schwier, Helmut, *Tempel und Tempelzerstörung*. Untersuchungen zu den theologischen und ideologischen Faktoren im ersten jüdisch-römischen Krieg (66-74 n.Chr.) (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 11). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. xii-431 p. 15,5 × 23,5.

Sevrin, Jean-Marie (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity. La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 86). Leuven University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1989. xv-410 p. 16 × 24,3. 2.500 BF.

Strecker, Georg, *Die Johannesbriefe* (Meyers Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 14). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989. 381 p. 17,2 × 24,2. DM 98,00.

Thekkekara, Mathew, *The Face of Early Christianity. A Study of the Pauline Letters*. Bangalore, KJC Publications, 1988. xvii-259 p. 14 × 21,5. Rs/50.

Thompson, Mary R., *The Role of Disbelief in Mark. A New Approach to the Second Gospel*. Mahwah, Paulist Press, 1989. vii-189 p. 13,7 × 20,4. \$9.95.

van Iersel, Bas, *Reading Mark*. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. 261 p. 13,9 × 21,2. £9.95.

Wedderburn, A. J. M., *The Reason for Romans* (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1989. xi-169 p. 14,2 × 22. £9.95.

Wisselink, W. F., *Assimilation as a Criterion for the Establishment of the Text*. A comparative study on the basis of passages from Matthew, Mark and Luke. Kampen, J. H. Kok, 1989. 250 p. 16 × 24.

Varia

Bowe, Barbara Ellen, *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome* (Harvard Dissertations in Religion 23). Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1989. xvi-158 p. 14 × 21,5. \$14.95.

Brossier, François, *Atlante della storia biblica*. Brescia, Queriniana, 1989. 60 p. 16 × 23. Lit. 15.000.

De Vries, Simon J., *Bible and Theology in The Netherlands*. Second Edition (American University Studies VII/22). Bern, Peter Lang AG, 1989. xiii-171 p. 15,3 × 22,4. \$31.95.

Fogarty, Gerald P., *American Catholic Biblical Scholarship. A History from the Early Republic to Vatican II*. San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989. xviii-424 p. 14,5 × 24,5. \$34.95.

Grelot, Pierre, *Homélies sur l'Écriture à l'époque apostolique* (Introduction à la Bible Edition nouvelle 8). Paris, Desclée, 1989. 320 p. 15,5 × 22. 145 FF.

Herbert, Máire – McNamara, Martin (eds.), *Irish Biblical Apocrypha*. Selected texts in translation. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark Ltd, 1989. xxxiii-196 p. 14,2 × 21,5. £19.95.

Huehnergard, John, *The Akkadian of Ugarit* (Harvard Semitic Studies 34). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. xxiii-473 p. 16,6 × 23,4. \$29.95.

Longman III, Tremper, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 3). Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1987. ix-164 p. 13,2 × 20,2. \$6.95.

de Miroschedji, Pierre, *Yarmouth I. Rapport sur les trois premières campagnes de fouilles à Tel Yarmouth (Israël) (1980-1982) («Mémoire» 76)*. Paris, Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1988. 281 p. 21 × 29,6. 131 FF.

Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos. Volumen XXXIV. Fasciculo 2. Granada, Universidad de Granada, 1985. 184 p. 17 × 23,8.

Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos. Volumen XXXVI. Fasciculo 1. Granada, Universidad de Granada, 1987. 399 p. 17 × 23,8.

Miscelanea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos. Volumen XXXVI. Fasciculo 2. Granada, Universidad de Granada, 1987. 136-13* p. 17 × 23,8.

Motyer, Steve, *Israel in the Plan of God*. Light on today's debate. Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1989. 172 p. 12,5 × 19,9. £4.95.

Neusner, Jacob – Borgen, Peder – Frerichs, Ernest S. – Horsley, Richard (eds.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism*. Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1988. xii-368 p. 15,6 × 23,5.

Parker, Simon B., *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition*. Essays on the Ugaritic Poems "Keret" and "Aqhat" (SBL Resources for Biblical Study 24). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989. 248 p. 15,2 × 22,3. Cloth: \$29.95(\$19.95); paper: \$19.95(\$13.95).

Ries, Julien, *Les études manichéennes*. Des controverses de la Réforme aux découvertes du XX^e siècle (Collection Cerfaux-Lefort 1). Centre d'Histoire des Religions, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988. 271 p. 16 × 24. 650 FB.

Ries, Julien, – Limet, Henri (eds.), *Anges et Démons*. Actes du colloque de Liège et de Louvain-la-Neuve 25-26 novembre 1987 (Homo Religiosus 14). Louvain-la-Neuve, Centre d'Histoire des Religions, 1989. 470 p. 15,6 × 24. 1.200 FB.

Schweizer, Eduard, *Spirito Santo* (Piccola biblioteca teologica 18). Torino, Claudiana Editrice, 1988. 151 p. 14,5 × 21. Lit. 15.000.

Smith, Morton – Hoffmann, R. Joseph (eds.), *What The Bible Really Says*. Buffalo, N.Y., Prometheus Books, 1989. 256 p. 15,3 × 23,5. \$21.95.

Uffenheimer, Benjamin – Reventlow, Henning Graf (eds.), *Creative Biblical Exegesis*. Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics through the Centuries (JSOT Supplement Series 59). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1988. 225 p. 14,4 × 22. £27.50/\$46.50.

van der Meer, Willem - de Moor, Johannes C. (eds.), *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOT Supplement Series 74). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1988. ix-423 p. 14 × 22. £22.50/\$37.50.

Verheyden, Jozef, *De vlucht van de christenen naar Pella*. Onderzoek van het getuigenis van Eusebius en Epiphanius (Klasse der Letteren, Jaargand 50, 127). Brussel, Paleis der Academiën, 1988. 285 p. 18 × 26. 1.350 BF.

Vermes, Geza - Goodman, Martin D. (eds.), *The Essenes*. According to the Classical Sources (Oxford Centre Textbooks I). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1989. xi-103 p. 14 × 22. £16.50/\$28.00.

Williamson, H. G. M., *Annotated Key to Lambdin's Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. (JSOT Manuals 3). Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987, Reprinted 1989. 208 p. 21,5 × 29,7. £6.50/\$10.95.

Zibelius-Chen, Karola, *Die ägyptische Expansion nach Nubien*. Eine Darlegung der Grundfaktoren (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients B 78). Wiesbaden. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1988. xxii-256 p. 17 × 24.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA